The American Ecclesiastical Review

VOL. CXXIV, No. 2 FEBRUARY, 1951

CONTENTS

The Dogma of the Assumption . . *Bishop John Wright* 81

The Technique of the Legion of Mary
Bishop Charles H. Helmsing 97

Some Short Psalms . . . . . *Patrick W. Skehan* 104

The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment . *John W. Moran, S.J.* 110

Method for the Lay Apostolate . *Francis X. Mayer, S.J.* 119

The Meaning of the Church's Necessity for Salvation. Part I
Joseph Clifford Fenton 124

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

A Remedy for Headaches 144

The Marriage of a Paraplegic 144

The First Sanctification of St. Joseph 145

Forty Hours' Devotion Problems 146

Crosses on Corporals and Purificators 147

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1951, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Reburial Requiem Mass 148

Solemn Votive Mass of Thanksgiving 148

Folded Chasubles 148

Washing Hands at the Lavabo 149

BOOK REVIEWS

Religions of the Far East, *by George C. Ring, S.J.* 150

The Way of Divine Love, *by Sister Josefa Menendez* . . . 151

The Eschatology of St. Jerome, *by John P. O'Connell* . . . 152

L'ascese monastique de Saint Basile, *by Dom David Amand* 153

BOOK NOTES 155

EVERY CATHOLIC EDUCATOR, SCHOOL, and PRIEST

should subscribe to

The Catholic Educational Review

Edited under the direction of

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Department of Education

SOME RECENT CONTENTS:

- Teaching in the Age of Mary . . . . . Sr. Mary Peter, S.S.N.D.
- On the Service of Eminence . . . . . Rev. Edward F. Garesche, S.J.
- Adult Education . . . . . Sr. Jerome Keeler, O.S.B.
- The Status of Catholic Junior Colleges . . . . . Rev. Joseph B. Tremonti, C.S.V.
- Three Hundred Years in The Vineyard . . . . . Sr. Mary Regina, S.S.J.
- Wisdom Derived from a Study of the Life of Christ and the Liturgy . . . . . Monsignor W. H. Russell

Subscription Price: U. S., Canada and Foreign $3.50

Single Number 40 cents

Address: THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL REVIEW

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

WASHINGTON 17, D. C.

THE DOGMA OF THE ASSUMPTION

On Nov. 1, 1950, in the basilica of St. Peter's in Rome, in a setting unsurpassed for magnificence or meaning in the recent history of the Church, the Vicar of Christ, exercising his office as supreme Pastor and Teacher and in the plenitude of his Apostolic authority, pronounced, declared and defined as a truth revealed by God "that the Immaculate Mother of God, the ever Virgin Mary, having completed the course of her earthly life, was assumed body and soul into heavenly glory."[1]

Thus, in our day, the first solemn exercise of the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff since the definition of that prerogative in the Vatican Council, sets before us a truth to be professed by divine and Catholic faith conformably to the Vatican Council's decree: "all those things are to be believed by divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the written word of God or in tradition, and which are proposed by the Church, either in solemn judgment or in its ordinary and universal teaching office, as divinely revealed truths which must be believed."[2]

This brief commentary on the definition of the dogma of the Assumption in the Apostolic Constitution *Munificentissimus Deus* may well begin with the immediate antecedents of the definition as these are set forth in the Constitution itself. The Holy Father mentions at the outset the flood of requests for the definition of the dogma of the Assumption which followed that of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mother of God. Many had immediately seen in the dogma that "the Blessed Virgin Mary was at the very moment of her conception, by a singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, through the merits of Jesus Christ Saviour of mankind, preserved free from all stain of original sin"[3] the root reasons for the incorruptibility of Mary's body and her eventual Assumption, body and soul, into the glory of heaven. These privileges are most closely bound one to the other. The

[1] All the citations are from the English Translation of the *Munificentissimus Deus* by the Rev. Dr. Joseph Clifford Fenton, Editor of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, issued by the NCWC News Service, Nov. 15, 1950. This citation, p. 14.

[2] Vatican Council, Constitution *Dei Filius*, c. 3.

[3] *Ineffabilis Deus*, *Acta Pii IX*, Pars I, 1, 615.

Apostolic See was petitioned to define the dogma of the Assumption not only by individual Catholics, but also by those who could speak for nations or ecclesiastical provinces and, indeed, by a notable number of the Fathers of the Vatican Council.

Such petitions grew in number and urgency through the years from the Pontificate of Pius IX to the time Pius XII ascended the throne of Peter. All these petitions were gathered together and carefully evaluated at the order of His Holiness, Pius XII. On May 1, 1946, in the letter *Deiparae Virginis Mariae*, Pius XII asked the Bishops throughout the world this question: "Do you, Venerable Brethren, in your outstanding wisdom and prudence, judge that the bodily Assumption of the Blessed Virgin can be proposed and defined as a dogma of faith? Do you, with your clergy and people, desire that it should be?"[4] The response to that question, the fruit of prayers and petitions, of meditation in Marian Weeks and Congresses throughout the world, not to mention of scientific studies by historians, liturgists, patristic scholars, scripture experts, and theologians, brought out with convincing clarity that the dogma of the Assumption was in the divine deposit of the faith. On the feast of All Saints, Pius XII gave the final and irreformable judgment of the question by his solemn definition of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, body and soul, into heavenly glory.

Thus we are now in a position to make a selective summary of some matters of interest to theologians. The present Apostolic Constitution serves as a happy illustration of the sources of revelation, the teaching authority of the *magisterium* of the Church in both its ordinary and extraordinary exercise, the use of documents of tradition and the function of the Fathers, doctors, and theologians of the Church in dogmatic progress properly understood.

I. THE MAGISTERIUM

The definition itself presents a truth in the field of dogmatic theology. Dogmatic theology presupposes as established in fundamental theology these three propositions: (1) that God has given a public revelation; (2) that there are two fonts or sources in which we may find that revelation, Sacred Scripture and Ecclesi-

[4] NCWC translation, p. 3.

astical Tradition; (3) that the preaching of the ever living *magisterium* of the Church is the rule of faith.

Some of the corollaries and subsidiary theses connected with those propositions have received recent re-emphasis in the Encyclical *Humani generis*. Of particular importance, in view of their illustration in *Munificentissimus Deus*, is the prominence given to the assertion that God has given His Church both the sources of revelation and the sacred *magisterium*, having commissioned the latter to elucidate and explain what is contained only obscurely or merely implicitly in the deposit of faith. Further, the power to expound the deposit of faith authoritatively and authentically was given by our Lord, not to all the faithful, not to the theologians themselves, but only to the Church's *magisterium*. This power the Church has used again and again, throughout the centuries, in both the ordinary and extraordinary exercise of its authority.[5]

This sacred *magisterium* consists of the Roman Pontiff for the whole Church; it consists of the bishops for their dioceses. The power of the Church, exercised in its ordinary teaching authority, is recalled by the present Constitution in these words:

> This outstanding agreement of the Catholic prelates and faithful, affirming that the bodily assumption of God's Mother into heaven can be defined as a dogma of faith, since it shows us the concordant teaching of the Church's ordinary doctrinal authority and the concordant faith of the Christian people which the same doctrinal authority sustains and directs, thus by itself and in an entirely certain and infallible way, manifested this privilege as a truth revealed by God and contained in that divine deposit which Christ has delivered to His Spouse to be guarded faithfully and to be taught infallibly.[6]

The teaching authority of the Church, under the protection of the Spirit of Truth, preserves revealed truths pure and entire throughout every age, adding nothing, taking nothing away. Thus "the universal agreement of the Church's ordinary teaching authority" gives us a certain and firm proof demonstrating that the bodily Assumption of the Blessed Virgin into heaven is a truth that has been revealed by God and is, consequently, a truth that must be firmly and faithfully believed by all the children

[5] Cf. *AER*, CXXIII, 5 (Nov. 1950), 369.
[6] NCWC translation, p. 4.

of the Church.[7] Since this is so, the doctrine of the Assumption has hitherto enjoyed the technical theological note of *de fide ex iugi magisterio* and *definibilis*. At the same time, this statement in the Apostolic Constitution *Munificentissimus Deus* illustrates the meaning of the truth that the preaching of the living *magisterium* is the rule of faith, that is, a norm by which we can know with certainty what Catholics must believe with divine faith. When the truth is explicitly and solemnly defined, as the dogma of the Assumption now is in the *Munificentissimus Deus*, the technical theological note becomes *de fide definita*.

This exercise of the ordinary and extraordinary doctrinal authority of the *magisterium* enables us to appreciate the distinction between a *new dogma* and any alleged *new revelation*. A dogma is a revealed truth as proposed for belief by the infallible *magisterium*. Now we know that we cannot have a post-apostolic public revelation, but we can have a revealed truth already contained in the deposit of faith, only now explicitly proposed for belief. Thus, while it may be called a new dogma, the only thing new about it is that it is now *explicitly* proposed by the *magisterium*. This exemplifies true dogmatic progress, which does not and cannot suppose a new revelation, but consists only in this: that what was implicit in the faith of the Church is made explicit.

The Apostolic Constitution on the Assumption also sheds new light on the general answer to the question: "Why does the *magisterium* thus propose new dogmas?" That answer is: the Catholic Church with her doctrine is not a static organization; she is a dynamic organism. The Church is organized, but hers is the organization of a living body, not that of an inert mechanical arrangement. Hence, under the provident guidance of the Holy Spirit, the living Church reacts to internal and external influences. In the present case, internal influences occasion the definition in the tremendous growth of devotion to the Blessed Mother of God, a growth clearly born of an increased awareness of Mary's fulfilment of the role acquired with the cry of Christ from the Cross: "Woman, behold thy son," and an answering eagerness in Catholic hearts to fulfil the consoling duty imposed at the same time: "Son, behold thy mother."[8]

External influences, tending to set the timeliness of this defi-

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *John* 19:26-27.

nition, are not far to seek. The very headlines of the daily press, the all-too-common "blurbs" of periodical literature proclaim the tenets of the world against which this truth of the Faith is set in bright relief. The definition affirms the potential sanctity of the human body, its true dignity and value in the eyes of God, at a time when paganism had led to two superficially opposed perversions: a heathen cult of the body on the one hand, a heinous abuse of bodies on the other.

II. DOCUMENTS OF TRADITION

The *magisterium* is the supreme judge in matters of divine faith, the supreme interpreter of the fonts of revelation. Only the *magisterium* can judge of the extent or the material object of divine faith, but this does not prevent the *magisterium* from using the rich store of documents from tradition which are in her possession. Though the *magisterium* draws the truth from the deposit of faith which is in her keeping alone, she can call on her Fathers, doctors and theologians to help provide reasoned demonstrations of the truth which she propounds. The motive for assent to a revealed truth will always be the authority of God who revealed the truth. But for the intimate understanding of a revealed truth and of its harmony with reason, the believer will depend upon the theologian, working in union with the *magisterium*.

God illumines, governs, and preserves His Church primarily through the Roman Pontiffs and the bishops of the Church, but He helps His Church by yet other aids. In the first century He gave an abundance of charismatic gifts; in the following centuries, He caused the Fathers of the Church to flourish; in later centuries, He gave the theologians to the Church, Catholic in mind and spirit. The works of the Fathers and theologians, along with the more authentic documents of the *magisterium* (definitions, doctrinal decrees, symbols, encyclical letters, decisions of the biblical commission, catechisms, liturgical books, disciplinary decrees), comprise the documents of tradition.

In the Apostolic Constitution on the dogma of the Assumption these documents of tradition are used to bear witness to the truth of the statement "that it is definitely the business of the theologian to have recourse to Scripture and to tradition, since it is his duty to show how truths set forth in the Church's living *magisterium* are actually to be found, either explicitly or implicitly in these

very sources."[9] The Holy Father asserts that "all these proofs and considerations of the holy Fathers and the theologians are based upon the sacred writings as their ultimate foundation."[10]

This avowal enables us to examine with a two-fold purpose the proofs of the Fathers and theologians for the bodily Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary given in the *Munificentissimus Deus*. First, we can consider the proofs and considerations in the pre-definition stage; secondly, we can seek the new value they receive as a result of the definition.

III. SACRED SCRIPTURE

Before the definition, there was general agreement that the doctrine of the bodily Assumption of the Virgin Mother of God was not set forth explicitly in any text of Sacred Scripture. The Scriptural foundation of the faith in the bodily Assumption of the Virgin Mother of God meant, therefore, that the doctrine was implicitly contained in the texts which the theologians and scripture scholars used. The value of the proof from the various texts differed and was indicated.

The principal texts to which appeal has traditionally been made when seeking Scriptural foundation for the doctrine of the assumption are the following:

(1) *The Protoevangelium in Genesis.* Many used this text to conclude that since Mary is the woman in Gen. 3:15, the victory of Mary foretold in Genesis includes the triumph over death, consisting in the *anticipated* resurrection of the Mother of God, inasmuch as all who triumph with Christ will rise on the last day, conformably to the teaching of Paul. In evaluating this argument, the proof from this text alone was usually considered not to exceed probability, since it is based on the view that Mary is necessarily the woman in Gen. 3:15 *in the literal sense*, a view to which most authors have hitherto accorded only probability.

(2) *Luke 1:28.* The argument from Luke has hitherto been that the fullness of grace predicated of Mary in this text includes all the graces and privileges of Mary; therefore it includes her Assumption. In determining the value of this view, it was said that some ground for argument was indubitably established, but not enough to give great weight to conclusions based on this text alone.

[9] *AER, loc. cit.* [10] NCWC translation, p. 12.

(3) *Apocalypse 12:1-2.* It was urged that the woman clothed with the sun and with a crown of twelve stars is Mary and that one of her glories is the Assumption. In judging the value of this text for establishing a scriptural foundation for the Assumption of the Blessed Mother of God, many accepted the judgment of some impressive exegetes who held that the woman in this text is the Church, and that Mary is the woman *in a typical sense.* Final judgment on the value of the argument must be left to the Church.

(4) *From many places in Sacred Scripture taken together.* This argument from Scripture first established the title of all the faithful to a bodily resurrection (*I Cor.* 15:20-23); it then established that death is a punishment for sin (*Rom.* 5:12-19; 6:23; *I Cor.* 15:56; *Rom.* 4:25; and some add *Rom.* 8:19-23). From these texts, taken together with the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, the following argument was constructed: "Paul teaches that the resurrection of the body is the final stage of triumph over sin and death; that the *deferring* of this resurrection of the body until the Last Judgment is connected with sin and death—that it is a punishment for serious sin, either personal or original. Implicitly, therefore, it follows that anyone perfectly and completely free from personal and original sin is free from the deferment of the resurrection of the body. Such, of course, is the case of the sinless Virgin and Immaculate Mother of God. There is general agreement that this is the most persuasive of the Scripture arguments, although there has not been complete unanimity among exegetes and biblical theologians on the apodictical value of the argument.

In the *Munificentissimus Deus* the documents of tradition (works of the Fathers and theologians) concerning these texts are aptly employed.

Often there are theologians and preachers who, following in the footsteps of the holy Fathers, have been rather free in their use of events and expressions taken from Sacred Scripture to explain their belief in the Assumption. Thus, to mention a few texts frequently cited in this fashion, some have employed the words of the Psalmist: "Arise, O Lord, into the resting place; thou and the ark which thou hast sanctified";[11] and have looked upon the *Ark of the Covenant,* built

[11] *Psalm* 131:8.

of incorruptible wood and placed in the Lord's temple, as a type of the most pure body of the Virgin Mary, preserved and exempted from all the corruption of the tomb and raised up to such glory in heaven.[12]

Scholastic doctors had recognized the Assumption as:

Something signified not only in various figures of the Old Testament, but also in that woman clothed with the sun, whom John the Apostle contemplated on the Island of Patmos. Similarly they have given special attention to these words of the New Testament: "Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou amongst women," since they saw in the mystery of the Assumption the fulfillment of that most perfect grace granted to the Blessed Virgin and the special blessing that countered the curse of Eve.[13]

Later we read "holy writers . . . at that time employed statements and various images and analogies of Sacred Scripture to illustrate and to confirm the doctrine of the Assumption . . ."[14] and St. Anthony of Padua is specifically cited for his use of the text from the Psalmist quoted above. St. Albert the Great's use of the text in Luke 1:28 is also mentioned. The clear Scripture foundation for the dogmas of the Divine Motherhood and the virginity of Mary are used by the Fathers and theologians to shed further light on the texts which they use in connection with their expositions of the Assumption.

The other scriptural texts, traditionally used as foundations for the doctrine of the bodily Assumption, are mentioned in connection with the theological demonstration of the truth of the Assumption. The text in the Constitution is:

We must remember especially that since the Second Century the Virgin Mary has been designated by the holy Fathers as the new Eve, who, although subject to the new Adam, is most intimately associated with Him in the struggle against the infernal foe which, as foretold in the protoevangelium, finally resulted in that most complete victory over sin and death, always mentioned together in the writings of the Apostle of the Gentiles. [References are given to *Gen.* 3:15; *Rom.* 5 and 6; *I Cor.* 15:21-26, 54-57.] Consequently, just as the glorious resurrection of Christ was an essential part and the final sign of this victory, so that struggle which was common to the Blessed Virgin and her Divine Son should be brought to a close by the glorification of her virginal body, for the same Apostle says: "when this mortal

[12] NCWC translation, p. 8.
[13] *Ibid.*
[14] *Ibid.*

thing hath put on immortality, then shall come to pass the saying that is written: Death is swallowed up in victory."[15]

Thus the Constitution brings that argument from Scripture, which had been acknowledged as strongest before the definition, into close connection with the consideration of the harmony of this dogma with other revealed truths. Further, since these texts serve as a scriptural foundation for the defense of this truth ". . . which has been expounded and explained magnificently in the work, the science and the wisdom of the theologians . . ."[16] the definition of the bodily Assumption of the Virgin Mother of God adds force to the proofs formerly used, in view of the repeated declaration that "this truth is based on the Sacred Writings . . ." At the same time, the statement that some "have been rather free in their use of events and expressions taken from Sacred Scripture," and that they "employed statements and various images and analogies of Sacred Scripture to illustrate and to confirm the doctrine of the Assumption," sufficiently manifest that the *accommodated* sense of sacred texts has not the demonstrative value of the *typical sense* and much less of the *literal sense*. New value accrues to a text when the *magisterium* leads us to see more clearly how a truth is contained implicitly in Scripture and in tradition.

IV. THEOLOGICAL DEMONSTRATION

The function of the theologian in attempting to derive particular truths from the sources of revelation and to show that a particular truth is revealed and could be proposed for belief by the *magisterium* is well illustrated in the theological demonstration of the truth of the bodily Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Again, we will present the argument as it was commonly given in the seminary classes *before the definition*, then cite pertinent parts *in the definition*.

Before the definition, the doctrine that the Blessed Virgin Mary was assumed body and soul into the glory of heaven was held as *proxima fidei* or *definibilis*. It was taught as implicitly contained in other revealed truths and the proofs followed familiar lines.

First Proof. There exists in the Church a widespread and weighty tradition concerning the Assumption of the Virgin. The

[15] *Ibid.*, pp. 12 f. [16] *Ibid.*

only sufficient reason for the existence of that tradition, particularly in view of the Church's unfailing office of safeguarding the deposit of faith, is the apostolic origin of a revealed doctrine that after Mary's life-course was completed, she was assumed body and soul into heavenly glory. This is, substantially, the proof from the ordinary doctrinal authority of the Church.

Second Proof. This involves the theological content of three truths in which the Assumption is implictly contained: (1) Mary was associated with her Son in the victory over the devil, over sin and death; (2) Mary's Immaculate Conception, her freedom from original sin at the moment of her conception; (3) Mary's virginity in the birth of Christ. The first proposition was usually established in dogma classes by reasoning from the Bull *Ineffabilis* and the allusive argument from Genesis was confirmed by the comparisons in patristic writings between Mary and Eve, as well as the association of Mary with her Divine Son in the victory over the devil.[17] The second proposition is defined Catholic doctrine.[18] So is the third.[19]

Careful analysis of the concept of "victory over sin and death" reveals that this does not exclude the separation of body and soul, death in the ordinary understanding of the term. Christ, who was all-holy, "yielded the ghost" and died on Calvary. But it does exclude the corruption of the body in the grave, permanence in death. Hence the victory of the sinless Virgin Mary over death could consist only in the "anticipated resurrection" of her body, so that all corruption and all permanence in death might be prevented. Christ achieved this victory by His own power and through His own merits; His Blessed Mother shared this triumph through the merits of her Divine Son and by His divine power.

All through the history of the Church, in the writings of the Fathers and the theologians, the Divine Motherhood of the Blessed Virgin Mary has been stressed as the fountain head of all her privileges and prerogatives. For many centuries, the virginity of the Blessed Mother of God was esteemed to be the chief doctrine in which the truth of the Assumption was implicitly contained. With the definition of the Immaculate Conception new light was

[17] *Ineffabilis* and NCWC translation, p. 12.

[18] *Ineffabilis.*

[19] Cf. Symbols, *etc.*

brought to bear on the sources of the faith of the Church in the bodily Assumption of the Virgin Mary into heavenly glory. In this new light, it was seen more clearly than ever before that there was marvelous harmony in the revealed truths and that the Assumption was implicit in the Immaculate Conception.[20]

In the *Munificentissimus Deus* all these received proofs are presented. In the quotation cited in connection with the Scripture proof, Mary is presented as the new Eve closely associated with the new Adam in His struggle against the infernal foe. As the resurrection of Christ was an essential part and conclusive sign of His victory, so the "anticipated resurrection," the glorification of Mary's virginal body, brought to a close the struggle that was common to her and to her Divine Son.[21]

> Hence the revered Mother of God, from all eternity joined in a hidden way with Jesus Christ in one and the same decree of predestination, immaculate in her conception, a most perfect virgin in her divine motherhood, the noble associate of the divine Redeemer who has won a complete triumph over sin and its consequences, was finally granted, as the supreme culmination of her privileges, that she should be preserved free from the corruption of the tomb and that, like her own Son, having overcome death, she might be taken up body and soul to the glory of heaven where, as Queen, she sits in splendor at the right hand of her own Son, the immortal King of the Ages.[22]

Thus, all that is clearest and most cogent in the arguments of the theologians is incorporated into one magnificent paragraph from which shines forth the glory of Mary in her Assumption.

In the Constitution we find also a pertinent application of the famous *potuit, decuit, fecit* argument. The order is changed slightly, since the fittingness is first presented.

> These [the proofs of Fathers and theologians] set the revered Mother of God as it were before our very eyes as most intimately joined to her divine Son and as always sharing His lot. Consequently, it seems impossible to think of her, the one who conceived Christ, brought Him forth, gave Him milk, held Him in her arms, and fondled Him at her breast, as being apart from Him in body even though not in soul. Since our Redeemer is the Son of Mary, He could not do otherwise,

[20] *Passim* in the NCWC translation.

[21] NCWC translation, pp. 12-13.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

as the perfect observer of God's law, than to honor, not only His eternal Father, but also His most beloved Mother. And, since it was within His power to grant her this great honor, to preserve her from the corruption of the tomb, we must believe that He really acted in this way.[23]

The Constitution also directly associates this privilege of Mary's anticipated resurrection and glory with the privilege of her Immaculate Conception.

Yet, according to His general rule, God does not will to grant the full effect of the victory over death to the just until the end of time shall have come. And so it is that the bodies of even the just are corrupted and that only on the last day will they be joined, each to its own glorious soul. Now God has willed that the Blessed Virgin Mary should be exempted from this general rule. She, by an entirely unique privilege, completely overcame sin in her Immaculate Conception, and as a result she was not subject to the law of remaining in the corruption of the grave, and she did not have to wait until the end of time for the resurrection of her Body.[24]

The fruitful labor of theologians in the past, now so solemnly approved by the *magisterium* in this solemn definition, should be an incentive to theologians of the future to continue to investigate, at the bidding and under the sure guidance of the *magisterium*, the riches contained in the deposit of faith entrusted by Christ to His Church.

V. THE LITURGY

In the present Constitution another demonstration is taken from the Liturgy. At the same time an excellent appraisal of the value of the argument from the Liturgy is made. The familiar *lex orandi, lex credendi* has a new clarification in the following statement: ". . . the sacred liturgy, because it is the profession, subject to the supreme teaching authority in the Church, of heavenly truths, can supply proofs and testimonies of no small value for deciding any individual point of Christian doctrine."[25] And, further on:

However, since the liturgy of the Church does not engender the Catholic faith, but rather springs from it, in such a way that the practices of sacred worship proceed from the Faith as the fruit comes from the tree, it follows that the holy Fathers and the great Doctors,

---

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 12. [24] *Ibid.*, p. 2. [25] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

in the homilies and sermons they gave the people on this feast day, did not draw their teachings from the feast itself as from a primary source, but rather they spoke of this doctrine as something already known and accepted by Christ's faithful.[26]

If we join to these citations the words ". . . and the concordant faith of the Christian people which the same doctrinal authority [ordinary doctrinal authority of Church] sustains and directs . . ."[27] we have a clearer indication of the theological value of the Liturgy and of the consent of the faithful, inasmuch as both spring from the Church herself, teaching, directing, sustaining and nourishing the life of the *Ecclesia discens*.

Hence, the existence of the Feast of the Assumption in the Church for so many centuries and the lively place of this truth in the hearts of the faithful from time immemorial attest to the fidelity with which the Church fulfills her office of nurturing the flock of Christ with the doctrine Christ taught. Inevitably great solace and strength have always come from devotion based on knowledge of the privileges of the Blessed Mother, a knowledge flowering into tremendous love of Mary and into hope that hearts loving her may become more like the Sacred Heart of Jesus, model of Mary's own heart. The study of the demonstration from the Liturgy and the consent of the faithful is all the more appealing, since the definition of the dogma of the Assumption was occasioned, not by attacks on the Church from without nor by any sharp difference of opinion among Catholics themselves, but by the overflow of the vigorous devotional life which the Church herself has fostered.

VI. SUMMARY

The best summary of the matters treated, all too briefly, in this theological commentary on the Apostolic Constitution *Munificentissimus Deus* is to be found in the words of the Holy Father in the Constitution itself.

Since the Universal Church, within which dwells the Spirit of Truth Who infallibly directs it towards ever more perfect knowledge of revealed truths, has expressed its own belief many times over the course of the centuries, and since the Bishops of the entire world have almost unanimously petitioned that the truth of the bodily Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary into heaven should be defined as a dogma

---

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

of divine and Catholic faith—this truth which is based on the Sacred Writings; which is thoroughly rooted in the minds of the faithful; which has been approved in ecclesiastical worship from the most remote times; which is completely in harmony with other revealed truths, and which has been expounded and explained magnificently in the work, the science and the wisdom of the theologians—we believe that the moment appointed in the plan of divine providence for the solemn proclamation of this conspicuous privilege of the Virgin Mary has already arrived.[28]

In this commentary, we have considered the foundation of the dogma of the Assumption in the sacred writings; culled from the *Munificentissimus Deus* the proper value of the arguments from the consent of the faithful and from the Liturgy; and indicated the harmony of this doctrine with other revealed truths particularly with the virginity and Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Mother of God. Further, we have elaborated the use of the documents of tradition by the *magisterium*, arriving at the crowning of all the work of the Fathers, doctors and theologians of the Church in the solemn definition of the dogma of the Assumption by the *magisterium*, as it is vested in the Roman Pontiff when he speaks for the whole Church.

Now that the dogma of the Assumption has been defined, it is interesting to recall the considerations which entered theological discussions after the letter *Deiparae Virginis Mariae* and immediately before the definition. There was general agreement that the preparatory work for the definition had been exhaustively done. All agreed, too, that the heavenly glorification of the soul of the Blessed Virgin Mary could not be questioned, since her exalted holiness, her fulness of grace and her complete freedom from sin guaranteed that her soul was glorified at the moment of her death. Similarly, there was unanimity on the point that the complete concept of the Assumption involved (a) the death of the Blessed Virgin Mary; (b) the resurrection, the reuniting of the soul and body of the Blessed Mother of God; and (c) the translation and heavenly glorification of the Immaculate Virgin Mary, body and soul. Finally, it was clear that the faith of the Church regarded primarily this last element. In the theological discussions, three questions were asked and answered. The questions asked

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

were: (1) could the dogma of the Assumption be defined? (2) why could the dogma of the Assumption be defined? (3) would the death of the Blessed Virgin be included in the definition?[29]

The answers to these questions generally were: (1) yes; (2) because it is implicitly revealed; (3) though the death of the Blessed Virgin is certain, it probably would not be included in the definition but would be mentioned in a preamble.

Now in the *Munificentissimus Deus* the Holy Father solemnly defines, as a divinely revealed dogma, "that the Immaculate Mother of God, the ever Virgin Mary, having completed the course of her earthly life, was assumed body and soul into heavenly glory."[30] Earlier he had referred to the bodily Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary into heaven as a truth "which surely no faculty of the human mind could know by its own natural powers, as far as the heavenly glorification of the virginal body of the revered Mother of God is concerned . . ."[31] thus making this truth the partial direct object of the definition. Concerning the death of the Virgin Mary, after recalling the cares, hardships and sorrows of Our Lady's life, the Holy Father cites the fulfilment of Simeon's prophecy in the sword which pierced Mary's heart as she stood under the cross of her divine Son, and then adds these words: "In the same way it was not difficult for them to affirm that the great Mother of God, like her only begotten Son, had actually passed from this life."[32] Thus the tentative conclusion of most theologians that the death of the Blessed Virgin, though certain, would not be placed directly and explicitly in the definition seems still to be valid.

* * * * *

From these reflections theologians now hard at work in research and lecturing may well draw fresh inspiration and new vigor, with an eager re-dedication to those positive studies and speculative inquiries which their truly sublime office demands of them. They will be humbly gratified by the paternal accolade that the Holy Father has given their part in preparing the *Ecclesia discens* and

[29] Cf. "The Definability of Mary's Assumption," Juniper B. Carol, O.F.M., *AER*, CXVIII, 3 (March 1948).

[30] NCWC translation, p. 14.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

aiding the *Ecclesia docens* for this historic definition of the Assumption, a doctrine "which has been expounded and explained magnificently in the work, the science and the wisdom of the theologians . . ."[33]

✠ John Wright
Bishop of Worcester

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

Fifty Years Ago

In the February, 1901, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* the leading article, entitled "Beauty in Religious Architecture," by Abbé Hogan, S.S., describes the unity, variety, symmetry, etc., that should characterize a church. The author complains that no new style has yet appeared in American church architecture, but believes that the near future may produce at least a greater variety of forms and details. . . . Fr. Thomas Shahan, of The Catholic University of America, contributes an interesting article on an Englishman of the seventeenth century, John Aubrey, who, though not a Catholic, wrote some very significant historical sketches praising conditions in pre-Reformation England, and contrasting them with the circumstances prevailing in his own times. . . . Some practical suggestions regarding the administration of the last rites to hospital patients are proposed by Fr. A. Mulligan, of Birmingham, England. . . . An anonymous article explains the conditions for gaining the Jubilee Indulgence, which has been extended to the entire world for six months of the year 1901. . . . In the Conference section Fr. A. MacDonald proposes objections to the theory of the intentional causality of the sacraments, defended by Fr. Billot. . . . In response to a question it is stated that a Protestant boy may not serve Mass, since there would be a species of irreverence implied in this type of *communicatio in sacris*. . . . There is also a letter from the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda to a Bishop, stating that a couple who had entered marriage with the impeding impediment of mixed religion may not use the marriage licitly (even though it was valid) until they have received a dispensation from the impediment.

F. J. C.

THE TECHNIQUE OF THE LEGION OF MARY

A good pastor's chief concern is to be "another Christ" to everyone dwelling in his assigned territory. By personal visitation, conversation, exhortation, correction, teaching, preaching, and administering the sacraments he strives to radiate Christ. Sharing as he does in the Eternal Priesthood of Jesus Christ, he is painfully aware that only through his poor human instrumentality does Christ Our Lord ordinarily unite men to Himself as the members of His Mystical Body to save and sanctify them and thereby to glorify His Heavenly Father. If he could only multiply his presence, if he could only have assistants sufficient in quantity and quality to meet adequately his pastoral responsibilities!

The following observations on the Legion of Mary aim at depicting how, by approved and practical means, every priest in pastoral work can enhance immeasurably the extent and intensity of his priestly apostolate. The Legion of Mary is not held up as a panacea for all our ills. Its very successful role in specialized fields of charity such as the personalized care of the "down and outer" and its apostolate in behalf of the abandoned women and unwed mothers will be passed over. The Legion will be considered chiefly as it exists and operates its direct apostolate to souls in parishes in over five hundred dioceses and in tens of thousands of single units or praesidia throughout the world.

Because each unit is small and apparently insignificant, our American zest for numbers and large scale operations may elicit contempt. The Legion's importance and the reason for its long-range supernatural success is perhaps best seen in a study of the "standing instructions" read to the members at the first meeting of every month. These directives at first seem cold and arbitrary, but understood in the light of experience and achievement they reveal the Legion of Mary as a most providential technique given to the priest for multiplying his presence in the world.

I

"Legionary duty requires from each legionary, first: the punctual and regular attendance at the weekly meetings of the praesidium and the furnishing there of an adequate and audible report of the work done." This is the first of the standing instructions.

The Legion recognizes that good work can be done by individuals on occasions without meetings or any other routine. It nevertheless demands of those who freely take on its discipline this weekly meeting as absolutely indispensable. Only physical impossibility, such as illness, or moral impossibility, for example, the emergency care of a sick relative, would excuse a member in an individual instance. Were such reasons to necessitate a prolonged absence, the Legion permits a temporary leave of absence over a period of six months. Should it be necessary to prolong the absence beyond this period, the Legionary would be compelled to drop active membership. For the sake of unity and discipline the governing council (Concilium Legionis) has been adamant about this regulation whenever asked to permit exceptions.

Why this stringency? A study of the Handbook will reveal the reasons. It will suffice to give a few indications. This insistence on attendance at weekly meetings is a key to the military discipline (volunteer, of course!) of Mary's Army. It insures regular work and continuity in work; but more important, it insures self-denial and self-discipline to rule out the whim-and-fancy type of naturalistic endeavor which counterfeits true zeal. It insures the supernatural means of grace corporately derived from a meeting replete with prayer and dependence on Mary. It gives the essential training in charity and harmony derived from pooling resources and from the insistence in the meeting that quality of membership is judged, not by success, but by fidelity to the system—a "teamwork" enjoined on us priests in the frequent occurrence in the Divine Office of the homily of Our Lord's sending of the disciples two by two. It insures the mutual edification of reports on work done—a spur to the indolent.

Above all it gives the priest that control of the work which is a unique characteristic of the Legion of Mary. Since the Legion of Mary cannot begin or continue to exist without the permission of the Ordinary and the local pastor, the role of the priest at the meeting *as outlined in the Handbook* insures a lay apostolate—lay in its government and operation yet perfectly obedient and loyal to the authority of the Church.

Finally, the weekly meeting faithfully attended by the priest-director gives him the necessary opportunity in his brief "Allocutio on the Handbook" of gradually forming his little band of lay

workers in their interior life and imparting to them a priestly outlook on the missionary work awaiting them at every turn. Obviously, fidelity to this first regulation of Legionary service on the part of the legionaries will bear maximum fruit only if the spiritual director is willing to sacrifice one hour and a half weekly to attend the meeting himself and to fulfill his duties as director.

II

"Legionary duty requires from each legionary, second: the daily recitation of the Catena." The Catena consists of the Antiphon of the Blessed Virgin from the Lauds of the Assumption, the Magnificat, the Versicle and Response of the Immaculate Conception, and the Oration from the Feast of Mary, Mediatrix of All Graces.

It seems strange at first that, apart from the rosary and other prayers prescribed for its meetings, the Legion of Mary should ask so little by way of daily prayer from its active members, a catena or chain of prayer of less than two minutes. The analysis of the Antiphon reveals Our Mother Mary as the dawn heralding the Son of Justice, the moon beautifully reflecting her Divine Son, an army terrible against Satan and his cohorts. Thus the legionary is reminded that he is a participant in a war divinely victorious. The Magnificat composed by Mary herself places sentiments of absolute simplicity of intention and purity of affection in the heart and on the lips of Mary's soldiers. The legionary is thereby overwhelmed with God's goodness, power, and mercy, and his service becomes the outpouring of a grateful heart. The Versicle and Response of the Immaculate Conception recall the prophecy of Mary crushing the head of the serpent and for this task the legionary consents to be her heel. The Oration of Mary, Mediatrix of All Graces, emphasizes the indispensable channel of his supernatural valor and achievement. Accordingly, each legionary without fear of failure cheerfully undertakes every task assigned.

Apart from this obvious role of the Catena, the Legion of Mary, by making such a meager demand on the piety of its recruits, shows forth its supernatural shrewdness. With the essential dispositions of the Catena, the legionary sallies forth from his very first meeting to undertake supernatural work. The very impact

with sin, neglect, or spiritual mediocrity invariably forces the new legionary to realize that only supernatural means can attain a supernatural end. The spiritual director will capitalize on this new realization and from it lead his little flock of legionaries to the full flowering of the devout life. Daily recitation of the rosary, Mass and Communion, visits to the Blessed Sacrament, meditation and spiritual reading before long become the food for the legionary's interior life. Some active members go further, enter into the Church's official prayer life by reciting daily some approved office and quietly enroll as Praetorian members (see *Handbook,* p. 175); and as the legionaries grow in piety they grow apace in charity and zeal for souls. A parenthesis may be interjected: frequently when persons with a natural disposition for pious exercises are approached for apostolic work, they find the demands for unselfish charity too exacting. Their piety, apart from wise action, has become an end in itself. The piety of the legionary, fostered from the humble beginning of the *Catena Legionis,* will inevitably produce souls intent primarily on honoring Mary as *the duty* of legionaries, and from this true devotion to Mary growing in love of God and the neighbor.[1]

However, the most important reflection on the simple prayer obligation of the Legion of Mary is that no sincere Catholic of good will is automatically excluded from the Legion. Persons of great talent and strong will and leadership ability who might be deterred by too much pietism can easily be won for Mary's Army. Such frequently make the best legionaries.

III

"Legionary duty requires from each legionary, third: the performance of a substantial active Legionary work in the spirit of faith and in union with Mary in such fashion that in those worked for and in one's fellow members the person of Our Lord is once again seen and served by Mary, His Mother." The Handbook is careful to emphasize in this third instruction "substantial" and "active" in its prescription of apostolic work. Everything trivial is excluded. (The little niceties of kindness and affability

[1] Significantly, in outlining duties of legionaries, the Handbook captions its first section (p. 109): "The Duties of Legionaries towards Mary," and after devoting sixteen pages to this duty, it heads all other duties under the caption: "Other Duties of Legionaries."

are, of course, of the essence of legionary service.) The Legion will not admit clerical work by itself or telephone calls to recruit for any gathering or function, or sewing or collecting of funds, etc., to be substantial. Perhaps the key to its work obligation lies in the spirit enjoining "that Our Lord be once again seen and served by Mary, His Mother." This manner of doing the work implies "close personal contact," ordinarily as a result of visitation in pairs (the mystical symbolism of charity insinuated by Our Lord in sending disciples two by two). It implies establishing a friendship; even more, it implies not an attitude of slumming or looking down in pity on the poor of body or soul. Rather, it implies an attitude of awe, of always looking up in loving reverence to the one visited, whether, from a human point of view, he be better or worse than the visitors.

Instruction on the work obligation dinned into the ears of legionaries month after month is bound to produce lay missionaries who are tactful, merciful, loving, and persevering, even in the face of great difficulties and seeming impossibilities. An inexperienced director may feel that he himself could do much better work more simply and more successfully through his own efforts. Probably this is true immediately, but later he will see the marvelous spirit of charity grow in his legionaries, and above all, its contagious effect upon others. The good visited will be left better, and the evil ones gradually but surely reformed. Since the Curé of Ars declared that the world belongs to him who loves it most, the objects of all the supernatural love and devotion must eventually yield to Mary's conquering army. It becomes obvious why the Legion does not admit any case to be hopeless.

Practically, the Legion demands as a minimum weekly work obligation an assigned task of at least one and one-half to two hours. In addition, the legionary is taught to be always on duty, alert to conquests for Jesus and Mary. The Handbook goes into detail about intensity of effort and legionary aims; namely, the greatest good to the greatest possible number. Again, results will depend on the missionary zeal of the director who must be prepared to co-operate one hundred per cent with his lay assistants. His availability for visits to the sick, interminable interviews with and instructions of prospective converts, rendezvous of mercy and reconciliation for lapsed Catholics, not to mention his tact in

using every meeting with individual legionaries to guide and direct their spiritual life, will become the touchstone whereby he can judge his approximation to the ideal "fidelis servus ac prudens."

IV

"Legionary duty requires of each legionary, fourth: the preservation of an absolute secrecy in regard to any matter discussed at the meeting or learned in connection with legionary work." Far from permitting the sacred confidences learned in legionary service from becoming food for gossip or scandalmongering, the Legion of Mary from the very start causes its members humbly to safeguard their neighbors' reputation. Their participation in the priests' work makes this duty self-evident. The humility born of charity effects its fulfillment. Nevertheless, the Legion takes no chances. It threatens prompt expulsion for any possible violation.

Important as is the safeguarding of the natural and committed secret, this fourth of the standing instructions presupposes that eventually the legionary will be fully formed through the "Secret of Mary," Saint Louis de Montfort's own title for his beautiful treatise on complete consecration to Mary. The Handbook (pp. 120-24) gives a beautiful summary of this teaching. The secrecy safeguarding reputation is but a figure of the legionary's admission to the secrets of the Queen of Heaven. As the Legion grows, those who know and love it see increasing evidence of the fulfillment of the prophecy written by Saint Louis de Montfort in his treatise on the true devotion to Mary (p. 80) in which the Saint foresaw "a great squadron of brave and valiant soldiers of Jesus and Mary of both sexes to combat the world, the devil, and corrupt nature in those more than ever perilous times" which were about to come.

In conclusion, we add that this technique of the Legion of Mary is safeguarded by three solemn warnings given in italics on the opening flyleaf of the official Handbook:

> *"If past experience is an indication, no branch of the Legion will fail which is worked faithfully according to rule.*
>
> *"If unprepared to work the system exactly as described in these pages, please do not start the Legion at all. In*

this connection, read carefully the Section 'Legion System Invariable,' page 63.

"Without affiliation to the Legion (through one of its approved Councils), there is no Legionary Membership."

These three little paragraphs spell success or failure in undertaking the work of Mary's Army. Accordingly, each group must keep in regular contact with its governing council, either through the attendance of its officers and spiritual director at the monthly Curia or Council meeting, or through regular faithful correspondence with its governing council. Such subordination and direction may seem unimportant, and carrying it out will probably spell many sacrifices for all concerned, but no army can otherwise function properly, and neither can Mary's Army, the Legion of Mary.

✠ CHARLES H. HELMSING, D.D.
Auxiliary Bishop of St. Louis

THE EXCAVATIONS UNDER ST. PETER'S

This result [of the excavations] has been supremely rich and important. But this is the essential question: Has the tomb of St. Peter really been found? The final conclusion of the works and studies on this project answers that question most clearly in the affirmative. The tomb of the Prince of the Apostles has been found again.

A second question, subordinate to the first one, has reference to the Saint's remains. Have these been discovered? The remnants of human bones were found at the edge of the tomb, but it is impossible to prove with certitude that these belonged to the mortal remains of the Apostle.

This leaves the historical reality of the tomb entirely intact. The gigantic Dome rises exactly above the sepulchre of the first Bishop of Rome, the first Pope.

—The Holy Father in his Christmas radio message, delivered Dec. 23, 1950.

SOME SHORT PSALMS

The following selection of four Psalms with a few brief notes is presented in the hope of showing that recent study has made their structure and main ideas clear and easy to follow. In our traditional Vulgate they are all more or less obscure. Those who use the new Psalter will find that one of these Psalms at least is here given on the basis of textual study too recent even for that undertaking; they will very likely find points of interest in the others as well. The translation used here is that of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine edition;[1] the prose "titles" are omitted, and the captions are the Vulgate *incipits*, which will not anticipate for the reader the ideas to be derived from the text itself, or from the notes.

Psalm 86 (87) *Fundamenta ejus in montibus sanctis*

His foundation upon the holy mountains
2 the LORD loves:
The gates of Sion,
more than any dwelling of Jacob.
3 Glorious things are said of you,
O city of God!
4 I tell of Egypt and Babylon
among those that know the LORD;
Of Philistia, Tyre, Ethiopia:
"This man was born there."
5 And of Sion they shall say:
"One and all were born in her;
And he who has established her
is the Most High LORD."
6 They shall note, when the peoples are enrolled:
"This man was born there."
7 And all shall sing, in their festive dance:
"My home is within you."

The text supposed by this translation is that of a reconstruction by Fr. A. Vaccari, S.J., the final portion of which appeared in *Biblica*, XXVIII (1947), 394 ff. It sees a nine line poem with

[1] *The Book of Psalms and the Canticles of the Roman Breviary* (Paterson: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1950).

one basic meter throughout, subject to only slight variations, chiefly in the place of the *caesura* that divides the single lines into the customary two complementary smaller units. The ineffable name of God (in the translation, LORD) occurs at the end of the first, fourth and seventh lines. In the English of verse 2, this cannot be reproduced. In verse 4, the term LORD corresponds to the *me; ecce* of our accustomed translations; those who know Hebrew will see how. The final LORD of verse 5 has in the past often been made the subject of verse 6.

In verses 1-2, which state that the Lord loves Jerusalem with a special love, the thought is parallel to Psalm 131 (132) 13-14.

For the LORD has chosen Sion;
he prefers her for his dwelling.

"Sion is my resting place forever;
in her will I dwell, for I prefer her."

The sense of verses 3-7 is: The strongest, the richest and the most distant of peoples will be drawn to serve the true God; and because Jerusalem is His own city, they will recognize its glory with the psalmist, and all who can do so will count it a distinction to claim native citizenship within her, and joyfully celebrate her festivals. This type of Psalm in praise of Jerusalem is paralleled in the Psalter by Psalms 47 (48), 121 (122), and, as we shall see below, Psalm 132 (133).

Psalm 129 (130) *De profundis clamavi ad te, Domine.*

Out of the depths I cry to you, O LORD;
Lord, hear my voice!
2 Let your ears be attentive
to my voice in supplication:

3 If you, O LORD, mark iniquities,
Lord, who can stand?
4 But with you is forgiveness,
that you may be revered.

5 I trust in the LORD;
my soul trusts in his word.
6 My soul waits for the LORD
more than sentinels wait for the dawn.

More than sentinels wait for the dawn,
7 let Israel wait for the LORD,
For with the LORD is kindness,
and with him is plenteous redemption;
8 And he will redeem Israel
from all their iniquities.

In the Vulgate form of this Psalm, verses 4 and 5 are run together. "That you may be revered" is the true reading for the *propter legem tuam* of the Vulgate. The repeated "More than sentinels wait for the dawn" is given in the Vulgate only once (as *A custodia matutina usque ad noctem*). The original reads, "More than sentinels for the dawn," twice; and the verb "wait" has been supplied in the translation to make clear the application in verse 7. The psalmist therefore says first (verses 1-6), that his trust in the Lord's forgiveness is as steadfast and as eager as the hope with which the night watchmen of the city look forward to the coming of the new day. In professing this confidence before God he humbly admits (verses 3-4) that no man is free from sin so as to stand on his own before the bar of divine justice; and that it is only God's mercy that allows man to serve Him. Having proposed this example in his own person, the psalmist then (verses 6c-9) exhorts the chosen people to the same trust in complete and merciful forgiveness.

The ideal picture of the sentinel or night watchman is, of course, enriched by the associations of Psalm 120 (121) 3-4,

May he not suffer your foot to slip;
may he slumber not who guards you;
Indeed he neither slumbers nor sleeps,
the guardian of Israel.

Also the parallel between watching for God's mercy and watching for the new day is brought out most strikingly by the Church in her Advent antiphon, *O Oriens! Splendor lucis aeternae et sol justitiate, veni et illumina sedentes in tenebris et umbra mortis.* The traditional application of the whole Psalm to the souls in Purgatory can easily be carried out by making the Church on earth the speaker in the Psalm. She professes her complete trust in the Lord's mercy in virtue of His promises to her, for the heavenly fulfilment of which she prays and looks forward eagerly. In the same trust she holds out the certain hope of the Lord's

mercy to these chosen souls ("Israel") whom he loves in a special way.

Psalm 130 (131) *Domine, non est exaltatum cor meum*

O LORD, my heart is not proud ;
nor are my eyes haughty;
I busy not myself with great things,
nor with things too sublime for me.
2 Nay rather, I have stilled and quieted
my soul like a weaned child.
Like a weaned child on its mother's lap,
3 O Israel, hope in the LORD,
both now and forever.

The form in which this Psalm is here quoted omits a phrase at the end of verse 2 ("so is my soul within me") which has been placed in square brackets in the Confraternity rendering, at the recommendation of the writer of this article. It is present in the original text, which cannot be read smoothly as it stands; and the phrase has been made use of by the editors of the new Latin Psalter. If it is read, it becomes necessary to make of verse 3 a new sentence, not directly connected with what precedes. If, as has here been done, it is presumed that these words are an accidental repetition within verse 2, both the meaning of this Psalm and its structure show striking parallels to the *De profundis* (especially verses 6-7, see above), which stands directly before it in the Book of Psalms.

Instead of presuming to judge for himself (verse 1) the workings of God's providence, the psalmist shows towards God the same tranquil trust (verse 2) that a small child resting on its mother's lap shows towards her. This metaphor is often spoiled in discussions of the Psalm by stress on elements that the psalmist himself did not envision. The child is described as in repose on its mother's lap; it is not at her breasts, and that it is a "weaned" child is only an indication of size and age. For the time and place of the psalmist, the term means what we would call a toddler: probably from two to three years of age. Having affirmed in his own person the degree of tranquil confidence in God which the small child suggests, the psalmist proceeds to apply the same example to Israel, just as was done with the "sentinels" of the preceding Psalm. It does not matter for the sense whether the

application is made by way of command ("O Israel, hope in the Lord," as above) or by way of exhortation ("Let Israel hope in the Lord"—a possible reading) as in the Psalm that precedes. To understand the intimate link between the two Psalms, it is necessary to know that the word here translated "hope" is the same, in the Hebrew, as the word rendered "wait" in the "Let Israel wait for the Lord" of Psalm 129 (130) 7. The full meaning is, as has been said above, an eager, hopeful waiting; the thoughtful reader will perhaps pardon translators in any language for an inability to render it adequately by one same term in different contexts.

Psalm 132 (133) *Ecce quam bonum, et quam jucundum*

Behold, how good it is, and how pleasant,
where brethren dwell at one!
2 It is as when the precious ointment upon the head
runs down over the beard, the beard of Aaron,
till it runs down upon the collar of his robe.
3 It is a dew like that of Hermon,
which comes down upon the mountains of Sion;
For there the LORD has pronounced his blessing,
life forever.

Here there are no textual questions that will be discussed. Suffice it to say, that there are those who suppose the reference to the person of Aaron is an explanatory gloss alien to the metrical structure of the poem; and that in general the syntax of the Psalm is not easy to follow. No changes in text are implied in the translation given above. On the other hand, the interpretation to be offered differs widely from that now generally received. It begins from the local reference "there," that is, in Sion, of verse 3; and supposes that on this basis the "dwelling of brethren at one" in verse 1 is to be understood of *where*, rather than *how*, they dwelt. The Psalm belongs therefore to those in praise of Jerusalem, as was indicated above in discussing Psalm 86 (87). "My father, of blessed memory," said Rabbi David Kimchi (c. A.D. 1160-1235), "explained this Psalm as spoken of Israel, inasmuch as they were all brothers; it declares that their dwelling in Jerusalem together was good and pleasant, like the oil . . . or the dew . . ."[2]

[2] Cited from the edition of Bologna, 1477, in the Schocken Verlag's facsimile reprint.

We may accept this interpretation of Joseph Kimchi (c. A.D. 1105-70), rather than the others which his son supplies. The usual exegesis these days introduces the notion of the brotherly concord that prevailed in a patriarchal family living under the huge, spreading tent of the nomads. The present writer can see no unity to the Psalm on that basis; and for the reader's reflections on its meaning, he thinks it well to offer in conclusion the rather extended note on this Psalm furnished in the Confraternity edition:

> The psalmist rejoices in the compact settlement of the Israelite families as an evidence of God's blessing (verse 1), just as the same divine blessing would be signified by the fragrant oil of anointing (verse 2) used at the consecration of the high priest (Exod. 30, 22-33), or by the rich dew (Gen. 27, 27 ff.; Osee 14, 6; Joel 4, 17 f.) covering the mountain slopes round about Jerusalem (verse 3). *Hermon* is the majestic snow-capped mountain at the north of the Holy Land. Its copious waters are the type of the divine blessing that fructifies the soil. Similarly, *Aaron* is the type for any high priest consecrated with the same precious oil. The *life forever* was understood in the first place of the preservation of earthly life; it is capable of a fuller application in the light of the Gospel. The similes used seem to suppose that the psalmist saw the returned exiles living in and about the Holy City, crowning its mountaintop and spreading down over its slopes like a precious oil or a heaven-sent dew.

PATRICK W. SKEHAN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

NECESSITY OF THE CHURCH'S DOCTRINAL AUTHORITY

If the Church had no authority to intervene in the deductive or comparative work performed by reason upon Christian dogmas, she might as well abdicate her office. For if it were permissible, in a vital matter, that two schools, holding opposite and contradictory deductions, should exist within her bosom, then it would follow that a dogma could be no more than an empty phrase; for a dogma in these circumstances would be withered and killed, as an intellectual statement, by the impossibility of knowing what it imported.

—Bishop Hedley in *The Holy Eucharist* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1928), pp. 34 f.

THE DOCTRINE OF ETERNAL PUNISHMENT

In 1923 Percy Gardiner affirmed that scarcely any Protestants of his day believed in hell.[1] There is no reason to think that non-Catholic opinion has changed since then. For George A. Barton averred that "during these last years the writer has heard clergymen again and again confess that they did not know how to present the Gospel to a younger generation. . . . The fear of Hell has gone; interest in immortality itself is absent from the minds of many."[2] In further testimony of this state of mind we may cite C. J. Cadoux. "There was a time," he writes, "when the doctrines of Eternal Punishment and of the literal inerrancy of Scripture were fiercely defended as essential items of orthodoxy. . . . They have been dropped because they were felt to be not true."[3]

Even the immortality of the soul is questioned or denied. According to the Archbishop of York, "every consideration of serious importance intensifies the urgency of the moral demand for at least the possibility of life after the death of the body. Yet there has never been a period in which there was so little positive belief in this, or indeed so widespread an absence of concern for the whole subject."[4]

That is a sad state of affairs, but it is a shock to find the previously quoted spiritual leader cutting the ground from under the feet of morality. He writes:

> How can there be a Paradise for any while there is Hell, conceived as unending torment for some? Each supposedly damned soul was born in a world as a mother's son and Paradise cannot be Paradise for her if her child is in such a Hell. The scheme is unworkable in practice even for omniscience and moreover it offends against the deepest Christian sentiments.[5]

Let us examine the last phrase first. Christian sentiments should mean mental attitudes in accordance with the doctrine of Christ. Now Our Lord did not hesitate to shock sensibilities. He preached

[1] Percy Gardiner, *The Practical Basis of Religious Belief* (London, 1923), p. 233.

[2] George A. Barton, *Christ and Evolution* (Philadelphia, 1934), p. vii.

[3] C. J. Cadoux in *The Hibbert Journal*, XXXIV (1936), 616.

[4] William Temple, *Nature, Man, and God* (London, 1934), p. 453.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 454.

some unpalatable doctrines. His views on hell were precise and unyielding.

> If thy right eye is an occasion of scandal to thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee; for it is better for thee that one of thy members should perish than that thy whole body should be thrown into hell. And if thy right hand be an occasion of sin to thee, cut it off and cast it from thee; for it is better for thee that one of thy members should be lost than that thy whole body should go into hell.[6]

Here Our Lord appeals to a "selfish motive." This is frowned upon by the archbishop, even if the motive is not one of fear, but of personal gain. "We shall agree," he writes, "that if an act is done for the sake of the resultant pleasure or profit of an agent, so that apart from it it would not be done, it is not a truly moral act."[7]

This does not accord with the advice of Our Divine Lord. He advocated, "lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither rust nor moth consumes, nor thieves break in and steal. For where thy treasure is, there thy heart also will be."[8]

Two details mentioned by Christ in the parable of the prodigal son[9] are worth noting. The vagabond felt no shame for his ingratitude towards his father. He returned to obtain food. But his father saw him "while he was a long way off . . . and ran and fell on his neck and kissed him." The inference is plain. God our Father is quite willing to pardon a sinner who repents with a motive based on supernatural social security.

But to return to His Grace's main argument against external damnation. He asserts that a damned soul might have a mother in heaven, and "Paradise cannot be Paradise for her if her

[6] *Matt.* 5:29-31. Other references to hell by Our Lord are found in *Matt.* 10:28; 13:42 and 50; 18:8-10; 23:33; 25:41 ff., *Mark* 9:42 ff.; *Luke* 12:5. The language of Our Lord in *Matt.* 5 is metaphorical. Depriving one's self of a member does not assure salvation. The meaning of this: a man will sacrifice a limb to save his physical life. But the life of the soul is more important than that of the body. Whatever, therefore threatens the loss of the soul is to be thrust far from us; no matter how painful the action.

[7] William Temple, *op cit.*, p. 459.

[8] *Matt.* 6:20-22.

[9] *Luke* 15:11 ff.

child is in such a Hell." "The scheme," he further tells us, "is unworkable . . . even for omniscience."[10]

The archbishop has not sufficiently pondered the words of St. Paul, who cried out in amazement, "Oh, the depths of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How incomprehensible are his judgments and how unsearchable his ways!"[11]

But what of the mother whose son is in hell? God realizes that he is there. In fact God consigned him there. Now God loves every member of the human race more than does his or her own mother. The decree to redeem fallen human nature by the agonizing death on the cross proves this conclusively. Nevertheless, God condemns unrepentant sinners to eternal damnation. Therefore happiness can exist in heaven together with the realization that one once dearly loved is dwelling in perpetual torments. Most aptly did Dante sing, *E'n la sua volontade e nostra pace.*

Lessius also writes aptly on this point:

> They [the blessed] are so drawn to God by thought and desire, that they go out of themselves entirely, giving not a thought to their own affairs, seeking for themselves nothing except inasmuch as it pertains to God, and can serve His glory. All their thoughts, cares, and motions of self love are entirely killed. They are dead to themselves and live only to God. They have thrown off the human life, which thinks and cares only for self, and have put on the divine life, which consists in contemplating, loving and praising God above all and in all. No longer are they anxious that their sons and nephews be promoted to riches and honors (in which nearly every thought of mortals is concentrated): they do not rejoice when these accrue to the family, nor grieve when they are taken away. Moreover, they are not affected by grief, when they see their own relatives damned, but they praise the divine justice, and are eager that it be served. This ecstasy, the divine love works in them.[12]

Did not Christ shower upon Judas singular marks of affection? Is he, therefore, unhappy if Judas is now numbered among the damned? Our Blessed Mother is in heaven supremely happy. She loved each human being with tender devotion. One of her

[10] William Temple, *op cit.*, p. 454.

[11] *Rom.* 11:33.

[12] L. Lesii, S. J., *Opuscula III, De summo bono*, 9th ed. (Paris, 1880), p. 101 (2, 12).

proudest titles is Mother of Sinners. Yet some of those who have passed through the portals of death are never destined to share her felicity.

Heaven is not just a sublimated earth.

As for hell, His Grace does not deny its existence; he contends that souls are not punished there eternally. Probably they are annihilated.

> There are sayings which speak of being cast into undying fire. But if we do not approach these with the presupposition that what is cast in is indestructible, we shall get the impression, not that it will burn, but that it will be destroyed. And so far as the difficulty is concerned with the terms "eternal" and "everlasting" as in Matt. XXV, 46 ("eternal punishment"), it must be remembered that the Greek word is αἰώνιος, which has primary reference to the quality of the age to come, and not to its infinity. . . . After all, annihilation is an everlasting punishment, though it is not unending torment.[13]

To answer this difficulty, we have merely to examine the meanings in the New Testament of αἰώνιος and of κόλασις (punishment). The first word signifies (1) that which is without beginning. Thus St. Paul writes of "the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery which has been kept in silence from *eternal* ages";[14] αἰώνιος may connote (2) that which has no end. "We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen. For the things that are seen are temporal, but the things that are not seen are eternal."[15] In a doxology the apostle refers to God as "King of Kings and Lord of Lords . . . to whom be honor and *everlasting* dominion."[16]

We must note that in Matt. 25:46, αἰώνιος modifies both "life" (in heaven) and "punishment" (in hell). Therefore in this line it has the same signification in both cases. Certainly no Christian denies that the blessed are happy forever with God. The very concept of perfect happiness which has an end is repugnant. Therefore the punishment of the damned is endless.

As for the meaning of κόλασις which the Archbishop affirms may in the context signify annihilation, F. Zorell notes that the

[13] William Temple, *op. cit.*, p. 464.
[14] *Rom.* 16:25.
[15] *II Cor.* 4:18.
[16] *I Tim.* 6:16. See also *Heb.* 13:20; 9:15; *II Cor.* 5:1; *Luke* 16:9.

word is akin to κολάζομαι. This verb has two meanings: (1) to restrain something, as an exuberant plant or a vice, from full evolution; (2) to restrain a person by penalties from further delinquencies, to punish. To the noun he assigns as a first meaning, restraint by punishment, *supplicium*, and he cites as an example of this signification, our text, Matt. 25:46.[17]

The New Edition of Liddell and Scott, *Greek English Lexicon*[18] is highly esteemed. What does this work have on κόλασις? These are the meanings: (1) checking the growth of trees; (2) chastisement, correction. It is the opposite of τιμωρία, and an example of this second meaning is Matt. 25:46. τιμωρία this lexicon defines as retribution, vengeance, differing from κόλασις, corrective punishment. Even if we were to accept this meaning, the soul still lives, it is not annihilated.

But in Matt. 25:46 κόλασις connotes retribution, vengeance. The concept of eternal corrective punishment is a contradiction in terms. Corrective punishment of its nature has a terminus. In that case we would have a discharge of those sentenced to hell. That this is not the case will be proved later by the refutation of a statement by Arthur Darby Nock.

It is true that κόλασις in verse 46 is contrasted with ζωή (life). But this latter word in the context and often in the New Testament signifies the life of faith, sanctifying grace, the bliss of heaven, or God the giver of these.[19]

Annihilation is not eternal punishment. How can a being who has ceased to exist, be punished? Why should the fires of hell be unquenchable,[20] if there are no victims to suffer in them?

But victims there are. They suffer eternally. "Their worm" of conscience dies not.[21]

[17] F. Zorell, *Lexicon graecum novi testamenti*, 2nd ed. (Rome, 1931), *s.v.*

[18] Revised and augmented throughout the H. S. Jones with the assistance of R. McKenzie, Oxford. (The date is not given, but there is a postscript written in 1940.)

[19] *John* 1:4; 17:3; *Rom.* 6:23; *II Cor.* 4:10; *Col.* 3:3 and 4; *I John* 1:2; 5:20.

[20] *Mark* 9:42 and 44.

[21] *Ibid.*, 9:47. Here worm is to be taken metaphorically and fire in vv. 44 and 46 literally. J. Knabenbauer in *h. l.* maintains that from these lines alone, one could not assert the presence of fire in hell. The doctrine, however, is certain from other statements of Our Lord. The description of hell

St. John saw this vision:

If any one worships the beast . . . he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the sight of the holy angels and in the sight of the Lamb. And the smoke of their torments goes up *forever and ever;* and they rest neither day nor night, they who have worshipped the beast and its image, and anyone who receives the mark of its name.[22]

The Apostolic Fathers of Asia follow in the footsteps of the Beloved Disciple. St. Ignatius wrote to the Ephesians (16, 2) concerning anyone who "by evil doctrine ruins the faith in God, for whom Jesus Christ was crucified! Such a filthy creature who will go into unquenchable fire; as will any one who listens to him."[23]

There is a striking passage in the *Martyrdom of St. Polycarp* (2):

And so, their minds fixed on the grace of Christ, they despised the world's torments and in the space of a single hour purchased eternal life. To them the fire of their inhuman torturers was cold, for what they envisaged was escape from eternal and unquenchable fire.[24]

The Apostle of the Gentiles is no less explicit.

The Lord Jesus will come from heaven with the angels of his power, in flaming fire to inflict punishment on those who do not know God, and who do not obey the Gospel of Our Lord Jesus Christ. These will be punished with *eternal* ruin, away from the face of the Lord and the glory of his power.[25]

This is clear enough. However, Arthur Darby Nock holds that the Apostle believed in the ultimate salvation of all. "The salvation of the predestined," he writes, "was clear to him from the beginning, but that was not all; somehow God would save every man. So (Col. 1, 16 ff.) God would reconcile all angelic powers to himself. . . . Paul had discarded the combative exclusiveness

---

as given by Our Saviour and found in St. Mark is taken from *Isaias* 66:24. Here we find this picture. The worshippers of God (the new heavens and the new earth) assist before the face of the God. The bodies of the wicked lie prostrate. They burn and are not destroyed, they are continually gnawed by worms, but are not consumed. Cf. J. Knabenbauer in *Isaias*, II, 521 ff.

[22] *Apoc.* 14:10-12.

[23] *Ancient Christian Writers (A.C.W.)*, I; (Westminster, Md., 1946), 66.

[24] *A.C.W.*, VI, 91.

[25] *II Thess.* 1; 7-10.

of Apocalyptic."[26] Now St. Paul, we may be sure, does not contradict himself on a highly important doctrinal point. In Col. 1:20, he says that the purpose of God the Father was "that through him [Christ] he should reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in the heavens, making peace through the blood of his cross."[27] The word ἀποκαταττάσσω means reconcile, bring back to a former state of friendship.[28] Christ reconciles angels and men by filling up the gap left by the fall of the angels. The saved take the place of these latter.

This interpretation is made plain if we keep in mind the dominant error of the Colossians. They relied on the mediation of angels, and were apt to underestimate the Great Mediator. The Apostle, consequently, deals with the latter's relation with the Father, in creation, and in the life of the Church. Christ is supreme in the order of nature and of grace.[29]

But what of the devils? Their leader is "the prince of the power of the air about us,"[30] and they are to be numbered among the enemies of Christ.[31] They are to be conquered, and so finally death, which the devil brought into this world.[32]

[26] Arthur Darby Nock, *St. Paul* (London, 1938), pp. 204 ff.

[27] A similar expression is found in *Eph.* 1:10.

[28] F. Zorell, *Lexicon graecum, s.v.*

[29] Cf. F. Prat, *La théologie de Saint Paul*, I, 20th ed. (Paris, 1930), 343 ff., and II, 18th ed., 107 ff.

[30] *Eph.* 2:2.

[31] *Rom.* 8:38, *I Cor.* 2:8. E. B. Allo in *h. l.* maintains that the evil angels did not pierce the secret of the Incarnation. They recognized Christ as a holy man, and as the Messias, who fulfilled prophecies, but not as God. The latter point is challenged by D. J. Saunders in *Theological Studies*, IX (1948), 536-53. This article is a scholarly study, based on an examination of the Fathers and Scholastic Theologians.

[32] *I Cor.* 15:24-29. On these verses, see E. Allo, *Première épitre aux Corinthiens* (Paris, 1934), p. 408. A few words on the doctrine of Origen on the ἀποκατάστασις seem to be in order here. Lucifer will never attain to heaven. *Comm. in Matt.*, 8 (*MPG*, XIV, 1185); *De principiis*, 1, 6, 3 (*MPG*, XI, 169). All others will. Holy Writ does not contradict this. *De prin*, 2, 3, 5 (*MPG*, XI, 193); also *MPG*, XVI, 1030. Passages in Scripture which apparently speak of eternal damnation are written to deter the wicked. Their inner signification can be discovered. *Contra Celsum* 5, 15 and 6, 72 (*MPG*, XI, 1204 and 1407). God chastises with fire only to correct as a physician uses iron and fire. *De prin* 2, 10, 6 (MPG, XI, 258). There is no such thing as falling from heaven when it is attained. *De prin*

Finally we have the reckless statement of Shailer Mathews, "The appeal to be saved in the sense of escaping eternal torture and enjoying eternal bliss gains no response except from those who live in the atmosphere of pre-scientific fears."[33]

We append here a few scientists who are Roman Catholics and hence believe in hell. They, presumably, "live in the atmosphere of pre-scientific fears."

Anthropology. Rev. Willhelm Schmidt, S.V.D., founder of *Anthropos,* author of the monumental, *Der Ursprung des Gottesidee;* H. Obermaier, contributor of nearly all the articles on the paleolithic period in the fifteen volume *Reallexicon der Vorgeschichte;* Abbé Henri Breuil, authority on the Mousterian period and the caves of the Dordogne.

Astronomy, Abbé Le Maitre, astronomical cosmologist; Aloysius Gatterer, S.J., Vatican observatory, astrophysicist; Daniel O'Connell, S.J., Riverview Observatory, Sydney, Australia, celebrated for his work on variable stars.

Biology. Joseph Assmuth, S.J., Fordham University, famous for original researches in termites and termitophilous insects (Fr. Assmuth spent many years of research in India); Elizabeth Crosby, professor of anatomy, University of Michigan; Paschal Perone, plant pathologist, New York Botanical Garden, discoverer of three new species of plant bacteria attacking ornamental plants, inventor of Rutgers Aero-Plant propagator for rooting plants without soil or other solid media.

Chemistry. Hugh Stott Taylor, chairman of the department and dean of the graduate school, Princeton, member of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences; Francis Owen Rice, chairman of the department, The Catholic University of America; Peter Debeye, chairman of the department, Cornell, Nobel Prize winner, member of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences.

3, 6, 6 (*MPG,* XI, 338 ff.). A. D'Alès in *Thought,* I (1926), 475-94 brings out the fact that in the Council of Florence the Latins did not insist on a definition of true and material fire in Purgatory, as this doctrine to the Greeks smacked of originism.

[33] Shailer Mathews, *New Faith for Old* (New York, 1936), p. 234.

Physics and Mathematics. Victor Hess, Fordham University, holder of the Nobel Prize for discovery of cosmic rays; Enrico Fermi, professor of physics, University of Chicago, Nobel Prize winner; Karl Herzfeld, head of the department, The Catholic University of America, formerly professor of physics at Johns Hopkins.

Shailer Mathews, incidentally, was not a scientist. When he wrote the words quoted above he was dean emeritus of the Divinity School, University of Chicago.

JOHN W. MORAN, S.J.

Weston College
Weston, Mass.

FAITH—BUT NOT GULLIBILITY

We are witnessing, during these years, a great number of crowds gathering around persons or places that are said to be connected with extraordinary spiritual manifestations. At the same time churches are left empty. How many Masses are being celebrated with no one of the faithful present to hear them! How many hours pass without anyone showing himself before the tabernacle where Jesus is! How many of the poor and the sick never see a friendly face, never hear a friendly word, and find the world like a desert and their lives a prison! And yet we see throngs of Catholics—let us call them Catholics—who come running madly and work themselves into a frenzy of excitement unbecoming to a Christian at the first rumor of something marvelous. Surely the whole of Christian life is filled with marvels, but no one makes anything of this fact. The natural life itself is a series of stupendous visions, and no heart seems disturbed for this reason. Yet, the crowds gather around the charlatans.

—Don Giuseppe de Luca, in *L'Osservatore Romano della Domenica*, XVII, 47 (Nov. 10, 1950), 6 f.

METHOD FOR THE LAY APOSTOLATE

The beloved and saintly Cardinal Suhard of Paris in his now world-renowned pastoral *Growth and Decline* written shortly before his death put it this way: "It will be the honor of our generation to have understood that the new situation of mankind requires new apostolic conditions." His optimism was refreshing. "Who could make us believe," he says, "that the Church is dying? . . . The great forces which are traversing the Church, the undercurrents which are uplifting it are not signs of death. They portend the sap rising in the vine, the coming of Spring." "The Catholic Church is always new because the Spirit which animates her is always new."

It is true the Holy Spirit of God seems to be pouring Himself out into the hearts of our Catholic laity these days. They have suddenly become articulate; they have begun to take pen in hand to spread their own enthusiasm for the faith suddenly come alive within them. Perhaps, it is this working of the Spirit of God that accounts for the spontaneous growth of such things as Serra Clubs all over the nation. The joyousness and wholeheartedness of the response to participation in the family rosary preached by Fr. Patrick Peyton is another instance. And now, "Block Rosaries." How else explain the astonishing spread of the Christopher movement among all classes of people, and even among non-Catholics?

There are other indications, too, like the great surge in convert work, the Liturgy coming back into its own as manifest in a more meaningful participation in the Mass, and the popularity of community sung Masses.

The *Catholic World* had a provocative article in its September issue by Mr. Ralph Chaplin entitled "Religion and the Workingman." It brings out the promise of our times for the Church among the laboring class. In the American labor movement, he tells us, "the trend toward revealed religion, and away from atheism becomes daily more pronounced. In ever increasing numbers the genuinely thoughtful and articulate one per cent of labor's leadership are finding their rightful place as soldiers of Christ." Why not enlist them in an apostolate? Mr. Chaplin concludes: "The workingman and revealed religion are being brought together again. God is not on trial in this world, freedom is. It won't be God's fault if the wrong choice is made." We must not let them down.

In the same issue appears another challenge, this from the pen of Miss Sally Whelan Cassidy in her monthly feature "The Catholic Revival." "I have been realizing of late," she says, "to what extent the Catholic-educated Catholic is isolated in his formation from the non-Catholic. . . . we need, and need desperately, both priests and laymen who are men of their age. . . . we need to enter the full swim of life around us. We need something which will end the isolation of the individual Catholic."

The time seems ripe, then, for a technique which will provide our enthusiastic laity with the means they seem to be groping for to bring Christ back into today's thinking and living. It would seem inevitable that the more thoughtful and practical among them would sooner or later realize that an individual apostolate is not sufficient for such a job.

A method which Cardinal Verdier of Paris called "The miracle of the 20th Century, the hope of the Catholic Church," seems to be our answer to them. It is operative today in over forty countries. This is the Jocist technique. Because it has been but vaguely known it has been notoriously misunderstood. Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward Moore describes it well in the October *Messenger of the Sacred Heart.*

It is this that Cardinal Suhard had in mind in the above quotation. Later he is more explicit. "The profound transformation indispensable to the Christianization of the world, will be accomplished by entrusting to the laity more and more responsibilities and by associating it ever more and more closely with the efforts of the hierarchy."

"This joint effort," he continues, "indicates that the apostolate ought to be a community-minded one. . . . This does not mean living together. It presupposes primarily team-work. The bearers of the Gospel must not act as independent workers, but devote themselves to the same action with a complete convergence of views and methods. The results will be *ten times greater.* Isolated, the Christian is an island in an ocean of indifference."

Pius XI stated that the Jocist technique was "an authentic form, a perfect exemplar of Catholic Action," and he asked that notwithstanding the changes made necessary by adaptation to different countries (it began in Belgium) "*its essential character be safeguarded.*"

What is this essential character?

In addition to the fundamental prerequisite that we have men and women with this burning desire to do something for the Faith and at least the eagerness to become more informed, the basic idea boils down to three things: an investigation into one's surroundings, an observation, as it is called, of things as they are around us; a judgment on this state of things in the light of Christian principles and traditional teaching and a decision to do something about it; and then, *action*. As the former bishop of Manchester, New Hampshire, His Excellency Bishop Peterson, a convinced advocate of Catholic Action's way, expressed it: "Jocism is Catholic Action in action. It does not lecture or study Catholic Action, it *is* Catholic Action." This work, then, will be carried on by a small (preferably small, always), group of ardent lay people bent upon re-Christianizing the surroundings they live in or work in, men and women with true initiative gravitating naturally into groups and under the guidance of a priest.

This sounds like another organization. God forbid that we should continue multiplying them further and dissipating our forces. No elaborate new organization is necessary. The framework is already laid down, even an eventual central headquarters is at our disposal. Within existing Catholic societies, within Confraternities and Councils this idea can take root and mature. Within the unions which create national impact, whether of the professional or of the laboring groups, will be found some few, at least, anxious to inculcate Christian thought and morals. These few will become centers radiating the truth.

Isn't it true that despite our extensive school system, our innumerable societies etc., we are still not bringing Christ into American life to any appreciable extent? Nor do we seem to be changing the pagan way of thinking so prevalent today in the U. S. A., nor the godlessness blatant everywhere; nor do we seem to be curbing the looseness of morals and loss of even elementary Christian concepts. Of course, all this is admittedly an enormous job, but it can be done, just as the early Christian communities permeated the paganism around them and the barbarian hordes that swarmed over them and enveloped them. Eventually, even rapidly, it was Christ that triumphed through them and finally established His reign over the whole face of Europe.

To meet this challenge it seems essential that those interested meet and plan—wisely. No matter what their conditions or states in life small groups can gather around a cleaned-off dinner table and discuss their future plans and pray together much as today's Serra Clubs are doing all over the country.

It will not be long before these modern Christian gatherings are face to face with the seriousness of the loss of faith in our times. Perhaps for the first time some may become fully conscious of things as they really are. They will need to deepen their own faith if they are going to give of it to others. And the Jocist technique provides for that. They will judge things in the light of the Scriptures, the words and actions of Christ, and the pronouncements of the Church. Their attention will also be concentrated on intensifying their living faith, by coming into more vital contact with the liturgy of the Church by an intelligent participation in its rites. The Mass will assume the place of supreme importance in their lives, and for their apostolate it will be an infinite source of blessings. The sacraments and sacramentals will channel fuller graces into their souls as the rich symbolism and significance are unfolded for them.

Much is being done in all these lines already, but mostly on a scattered basis; much is being printed to bring home to Catholics the richness of our Catholic practices frequently so perfunctorily performed. Only by filling themselves with these graces can laymen and laywomen confidently go beyond themselves and bring this light into the darkness surrounding. No longer need they fear to open their mouths, no longer fear ridicule. They have the answers; but above all they have the confidence of men united for a common cause and combining the graces and wisdom of each to become a living realization, on a small scale, of the overwhelming reality of the Mystical Body of Christ. They are Christ acting, Christ acting through them upon their friends and surroundings. They have the assurance of success in the words of the Pontiff of Catholic Action, Pope Pius XI:

> In order to bring back to Christ these whole classes of men who have denied Him we must gather and train from amongst their very ranks auxiliary soldiers of the Church, men who know their mentality, and their aspirations and who with kindly fraternal charity will be able to win their hearts. Undoubtedly, the first and immediate apostles of the workingmen must themselves be workingmen while the apostles

of the industrial and commercial world (and we might add the professional field) should themselves be employers and merchants.

Has anything been done? Quite a bit, but slowly, so very slowly. Perhaps the greatest difficulty lies in the fact that the laity are unaware of this apostolate and of its simplicity and utter practicality for the Catholics of the U. S. A. It is growing, though. From San Francisco to Chicago, from Iowa to Texas, in Pennsylvania, Washington, Minnesota, Indiana, Illinois and other places it has taken root, and among all classes and groups of peoples, even among families for the salvation of this basic community of the nation.

Is all this discouraging the individual apostolic work so successfully being carried on? By no means. Without it Catholic Action could never get functioning properly, on a large scale. What could be more natural, for instance, than that a number of Catholics doing individual apostolic work should see the tremendous possibilities in the pooling of their individual efforts and enthusiasm to effect a more widespread good? What could be more certain than that a benediction from on high will be theirs, for wherever two or three are gathered together in Christ's name He has promised to be in their midst, guiding them in the light of truth and showing them the way. And since their eagerness is contagious, the zeal of this handful is bound to spread and to reach out farther and farther into the stream of society. Nor do they thus become isolated from the communities to which they belong. Rather they more fully participate in its life, cause a current of divine life to enter into its sluggish blood stream.

If the question of the day is separation of Church and State there is another separation which is eating away at the vitals of our very Christianity here in the United States, the separation of religion from the life of Christians in the professions, workshops, factories, and business offices. The Jocist technique has the answer to the problem of making more and more Catholics conscious of the vitality of the Faith and the happiness discovered in living it every hour of the day. The complement of this is the craving created in them to share these riches with those who are missing it. Let us pray that the promise of the spring bring a rich harvest into the King's granaries.

FRANCIS X. MAYER, S.J.

St. Mary's College
St. Mary's, Kansas

THE MEANING OF THE CHURCH'S NECESSITY FOR SALVATION

PART I

Three years ago *The American Ecclesiastical Review* carried a rather long article, entitled "The Theological Proof for the Necessity of the Catholic Church."[1] This article contained a statement and an analysis of what the documents of the Church's *magisterium* taught on the subject of the Church's necessity for salvation. It listed and evaluated the various scriptural proofs and *rationes theologicae* employed by outstanding modern theologians in support of this thesis. It closed with a brief description of what the author considered, and still considers, to be the material from which the most effective theological demonstration of this thesis can and must be constructed.

As its very title indicated, the article was concerned primarily with the process of theological demonstration. It took cognizance of the fact that an adequate theological proof carries with it necessarily an indication of the meaning of the thesis or conclusion supported by that proof. The immediate purpose of the article, however, prevented it from going into any detail on the statement of the thesis itself. It considered only indirectly and summarily the form into which recent manuals and monographs had put the thesis on the Church's necessity for salvation and the basic explanations of this thesis in current theological literature.

The appearance of the Holy Father's encyclical *Humani generis*, with its reproval of those who "reduce to an empty formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to gain eternal salvation,"[2] has made it expedient to take up in some detail the question of the form and the fundamental explanation of this doctrine. The teaching of the *Humani generis* is of the utmost importance. The encyclical itself spoke of this importance, and the Holy Father referred to it again in his allocution *Penitus commoto animo* when he listed the teaching of *Humani generis*, "*ad catholicam doctrinam integram et indemnem servandam.*"

[1] Cf. *AER*, CXVIII, 3, 4, and 5 (March, April, and May, 1948), 214-28; 290-305; 361-75.

[2] In the *NCWC* edition, p. 12, n. 27.

among the concerns "*quae summi quidem momenti Nobis cordi sunt.*"[3] In view of the seriousness of this teaching, and because of the fact that the doctrine on the Church's necessity for salvation is one of the theses that have been mishandled throughout the world and not merely in one particular region, a consideration of this thesis, particularly from the point of view of the recent encyclical, should prove advantageous.

Thus, in the present article, we shall first inquire into the meaning of the encyclical's expression, "reduce to an empty formula." We shall try to see what the expression means and look into its connotations as it is applied to the Catholic teaching on the necessity of the Church for salvation. This section of the article will be followed by a listing and an explanation of some presentations of the thesis found in current theological literature, some of which in one way or another certainly tend to reduce this doctrine to a vain and empty formula.

The second portion of this article will consider the background of the various inadequate presentations of this section of sacred theology. As it stands in modern theological textbooks, the teaching on the necessity of the Catholic Church for eternal salvation has a distinctive and a somewhat unfortunate background, a history such as to make inadequate presentation of the material somewhat easier and more likely here than in other sections of sacred doctrine. Apart from this general consideration, some of the less laudable statements of the thesis have their own particular histories in the chronicle of sacred theology. These histories are such as to throw considerable light on the proper expression of the thesis itself.

The third and final portion of the article will be devoted to a consideration of the elements which must be brought into an adequate statement of this teaching. It will end up with the listing of the basic propositions that can serve as a faithful and unequivocal expression of the doctrine on the Church's necessity for salvation.

"REDUCE TO AN EMPTY FORMULA . . ."

In the *Humani generis* the Holy Father declared that some Catholics "reduce to an empty formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to gain eternal salvation." The termi-

[3] In the *Osservatore Romano*, for Nov. 2, 1950.

nology he employed in this statement is a matter of particular importance. It would be impossible to use exactly the same expression in dealing with an inadequate or inaccurate handling of almost any other section of sacred theology. The teaching about the necessity of the Catholic Church for eternal salvation is, in by far the greater number of current theological writings, inextricably bound up with a definite formula, the "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*," or "no salvation outside the Church." There is no comparable situation existing in any other section of theological science.

Under various equivalent forms, this formula has been presented as a dogma of the Catholic Church many times during the course of ecclesiastical history. For this reason, no writer who claims the name of Catholic will ever presume to deny or to reject the formula outright. All the different types of explanation of the Church's necessity for salvation presented in the literature of Catholic theology claim to set forth the real meaning of this formula. Thus the bare axiom or formula has always been retained, no matter how erratically it may have been interpreted by individual authors.

The first and the most objectionable method of mishandling the teaching on the Church's necessity for salvation is to make the formula "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*" a mask or an excuse for disobedient and schismatical conduct towards legitimate ecclesiastical authority. Such unfortunately has been the procedure of a widely publicized group in our own country during the past two years. At the hands of the spokesmen for this group, the expression which is meant to crystalize the revealed doctrine on the Church's place in the divine economy of salvation has become a rallying-cry for opposition, from outside the Church, to the *ecclesia docens* of the present day. It is hard to see how men can reduce this teaching to an empty formula more effectively than by employing the formula itself as an instrument to draw their fellows into an obstinate withdrawal from the Catholic community.

One also reduces the doctrine of the Church's necessity for salvation to an empty formula when, professing to retain and to explain the assertion that there is no salvation outside the Church, he actually presents a teaching that runs counter to the obvious and primary meaning of this doctrine. The man who acts thus claims to hold the axiom "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*"

as an unquestioned statement of Catholic dogma while, at the same time, he holds that *de facto* people can save their souls even though they live and die outside the true Church of Jesus Christ.

There is still another way in which the usual statement of the Church's necessity for eternal salvation can be reduced to a mere empty formula. This occurs when the assertion is explained in a way that is incompatible with the statement of this truth in the documents of the Church's *magisterium*. It so happens that the Church's official pronouncements on this subject are not and have not been couched in the very words "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus.*" Thus the profession of faith prescribed by Pope Innocent III for those who were returning to the Church after having lived for some time in the heresy of the Waldensians, spoke of "the one Church, not that of the heretics, but the holy Roman, Catholic and apostolic [Church], outside of which we believe no one to be saved."[4] The first chapter of the dogmatic constitution *Firmiter credimus,* issued by the Fourth Oecumenical Council of the Lateran, under the same Pope Innocent III, states that "there is one universal Church of the faithful, outside of which no one at all is saved."[5]

But, where these two documents had stated that no person could achieve salvation without being "inside" the Church, the Bull *Unam sanctam,* issued by Pope Boniface VIII, employed the terminology which has become more usual in our own time. It referred to "the one, holy, Catholic, and apostolic Church . . . outside of which there is neither salvation nor the remission of sins."[6] This type of formula expresses the Church's teaching that salvation itself is something to be found only inside the Church. The other kind of proposition had set forth the other aspect of the same dogma, the truth that men themselves must be "inside" the Church if they are to obtain their eternal happiness in heaven.

Eugenius IV, in his Bull, *Cantate Domino,* a document which stands as not only the declaration of the Sovereign Pontiff, but also as a decree of an oecumenical Council, that of Florence, teaches that "none of those not existing within the Catholic Church . . . can become partakers of eternal life, but that [such persons] are going to go into the everlasting fire 'that is prepared for the devil and his angels' unless, before the end of life, they become joined

[4] *DB,* 423. [5] *DB,* 430. [6] *DB,* 468.

(aggregati) to that same [Church]."[7] Thus the *Cantate Domino* adopts the same sort of terminology as that previously employed by Innocent III himself and by the Fourth Council of the Lateran over which he presided.

Pope Pius IX habitually employed this same form in teaching about the necessity of the Church for eternal salvation. In his allocution *Singulari quadam*, he qualified as an *exitiosus error* the then widely disseminated opinion that we may well hope "for the eternal salvation of all of those who have never in any way lived within the true Church of Christ."[8] In the same allocution he stated that "we must certainly hold on faith that no man can be saved outside of the apostolic Roman Church, that this is the only ark of salvation, that the man who does not enter into it is going to perish in the deluge."[9] The same Pontiff repeated these formulae almost word for word in his encyclical *Quanto conficiamur moerore*.[10]

In this last named document there is a rather complicated sentence which has occasioned a certain amount of confusion among some recent writers.

> But it is also a very well known Catholic dogma that no one can be saved outside of the Catholic Church, and that those who are contumaciously opposed to the authority and the definitions of that same Church, and who are obstinately separated from the unity of that Church and from Peter's successor, the Roman Pontiff, to whom the guardianship over the vineyard has been entrusted by the Lord, cannot obtain salvation.[11]

Certain Catholic publicists and not a few theologians have misinterpreted this passage by imagining the presence of the word "only" before the passage that begins "those who are contumaciously opposed." Thus they wrongly consider the second portion of this proposition as a limitation of the first part, and represent Pope Pius IX as teaching that the expression "no one can be saved outside of the Catholic Church" means merely that the Church is necessary with a necessity of precept. Actually the statement asserts that the Church is necessary with the necessity of means and also with that of precept.

[7] *DB*, 714.
[8] *DB*, 1646.
[9] *DB*, 1647.
[10] Cf. *DB*, 1677.
[11] *Ibid.*

The assertion that "there is no salvation outside the Church," or, to use the form in which it is presented in most ecclesiastical documents, that "no one at all can be saved outside the Church," becomes merely a meaningless series of sounds or "an empty formula" in the hands of a Catholic teacher who presumes to interpret it in some manner incompatible with the manifest significance of any one of these declarations of the Church's *magisterium* in which the assertion occurs, in one way or another.

Theological writers can reduce the teaching on the Church's necessity for salvation to an empty or idle formula in this way when they take the declaration of Boniface VIII, for example, in his *Unam sanctam*, and state that the designation of the Catholic Church as the thing "outside of which there is neither salvation nor the forgiveness of sins" implies that all the means for supernatural salvation belong to the Church, in the sense that the individual who employs these means is actually, whether he knows it or not, availing himself of something which belongs to the Church, and then declare that the teaching on the Church's necessity for salvation involves nothing more than this. The writers who adopt such a course leave that teaching a mere empty formula as it stands in those documents of the Church's *magisterium* which obviously claim that an individual cannot be saved unless he himself is in some way "within" rather than "outside of" the true Church of Jesus Christ.

In short, the error deplored by the Holy Father in the encyclical *Humani generis* is to be found wherever the formula or, to be more exact, the formulae that tell of the Church's necessity for eternal salvation must be considered as meaningless in some or in all of the contexts in which this teaching is to be found in the authentic documents of the Church's *magisterium*. The same error is to be found wherever the explanation involves a notion of the Church or of salvation incompatible with the Church's declarations on these subjects, and wherever the expressions "within" and "outside of" are explained in some manner that would exclude the ordinary meanings generally attached to these terms in speech or in writing.

THE THESIS ON THE NECESSITY OF THE CHURCH IN CURRENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

It is imperative that we examine the various statements of the

thesis on the Church's necessity for salvation in current theological literature in order that we may see which among them can be said to fall under the censure of the Holy Father. An examination of the literature on this subject produced since the time of the Vatican Council shows that, while there are many definitely acceptable presentations of the thesis, and that while, among scholastic writers, these acceptable presentations manifestly outnumber those of lesser worth, there are still some statements and explanations of the Church's necessity for salvation which lay themselves open to the charge that they reduce this teaching to an empty formula. Some writers on this subject have carried through their attempts to minimize the significance of this teaching to such an extent that, for all intents and purposes, they have left the statement that there is no salvation outside the Church void of all real meaning.

One group of writers and teachers who have set out to explain this thesis have offered what seems to be nothing more or less than an outright denial of the teaching they intended to interpret. Such is the case with Arnold Harris Mathew's exposition of the formula "*extra ecclesiam salus nulla*" in the symposium he edited forty-five years ago.

> Now the further question arises as to how far Catholics are bound to hold that for those outside the Roman Church there is no salvation. Catholics are not bound to hold anything of the kind. The question resolves itself into the other question, how far those who are outside the Roman Church are in good faith or not.[12]

At the very beginning of Mathew's brief article, he protests against the statement, attributed to some "leading Protestant divine," to the effect that Catholics "are obliged by their creed to regard all who die outside the Roman Church as in hell."[13] Mathew's somewhat vehement retort states that his co-religionists "are not only not bound to hold any such opinion, but they are bound to hold exactly the opposite."[14] It is difficult to see how the teaching on the necessity of the Catholic Church for eternal salva-

[12] Mathew, in his chapter, "Extra Ecclesiam Salus Nulla," in the symposium *Ecclesia: The Church of Christ*, edited by Arnold Harris Mathew (London: Burns and Oates, 1906), p. 148.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 146.

[14] *Ibid.*

tion could more effectively be reduced to a mere empty formula than by this type of "explanation."

Because of the manifest incoherence of his teaching, and particularly because of his unfortunate defection from the Catholic Church during the latter phase of the Modernist crisis, Mathew as an individual never had any direct influence in the field of theological writing. Nevertheless, explanations of the Church's necessity for salvation roughly similar to his have appeared in Catholic periodicals from time to time during the past half-century, produced by well meaning but ill informed individuals who were so intent upon the task of overthrowing charges of intolerance that had been levelled against the Church that they completely overlooked the bounds of doctrinal accuracy in their own statements. Sometimes this tendency to explain the doctrine of the Church's necessity by what amounts to a denial of its practical import has assumed a less offensive though equally inaccurate form, as in the case of Otto Karrer's *Religions of Mankind*, the thirteenth chapter of which is entitled "Salvation outside the Visible Church."[15]

A second type of explanation of this thesis is to be found in Cardinal Newman's last published study of this subject, a study incorporated into his *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*. Mathew, who quoted the entire section *in extenso*, was convinced that the Cardinal had "dealt with the question in such a masterly way that it is impossible to improve upon what he says."[16] As a group, the theologians of the Catholic Church have shown no disposition to share Mathew's enthusiasm.

The great English Cardinal considered this teaching in his *Letter*, not directly for the sake of the doctrine itself, but primarily as an example of something which he believed could offer "the opportunity of a legitimate minimizing."[17] Following this line, he held that the principle "out of the Church, and out of the faith, is no salvation," admits of exceptions, and he taught that Pope Pius IX, in his encyclical *Quanto conficiamur moerore*, had

[15] In Karrer's *Religions of Mankind* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1938), pp. 250-78.

[16] Mathew, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

[17] In *Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1896), II, 334.

spoken of such exceptions. Newman quotes these words of Pius IX.

> *We and you know,* that those who lie under invincible ignorance as regards our most Holy Religion, and who, diligently observing the natural law and its precepts, which are engraven by God on the hearts of all, and prepared to obey God, lead a good and upright life, are able, by the operation of the power of divine light and grace, to obtain eternal life.[18]

Newman believed these words conveyed what he called "the doctrine of invincible ignorance—or, that it is possible to belong to the soul of the Church without belonging to the body."[19] He concluded his treatment of this thesis by the following question: "Who would at first sight gather from the wording of so forcible a universal [Out of the Church, and out of the faith, is no salvation], that an exception to its operation, such as this, so distinct, and, for what we know, so very wide, was consistent with holding it?"[20]

It is hard to see how a universal negative proposition that admits of "distinct, and, for what we know, so very wide" exceptions can be other than an empty or meaningless formula. As we have seen, the statement on the necessity of the Catholic Church for salvation must be considered, not as a mere series of words taken out of all context, but precisely in the manner in which it stands in the various monuments of the Church's official *magisterium.* As that teaching is found in, for instance, the *Cantate Domino,* it definitely does not admit of any "exceptions." If Newman was right, and if persons in invincible ignorance can be saved other than in the Church, the teaching of Eugenius IV and of the Council of Florence is definitely inaccurate. And, on the other hand, if it be Catholic dogma that none of those who dwell outside the Church can be saved unless before they die they become joined to the Church, then there is certainly no room for any sort of "exception" to the rule of the Church's necessity for eternal salvation.

It is interesting to note that Newman interpreted the doctrine of invincible ignorance as meaning that "it is possible to belong to

[18] *DB,* 1677. Newman quotes this passage in *op. cit.,* pp. 335 f.
[19] *Ibid.,* p. 335.
[20] *Ibid.,* p. 336.

the soul of the Church without belonging to the body."[21] He was convinced that his citation from the text of the *Quanto conficiamur moerore*, the citation reproduced a few lines above, constituted an expression of this teaching. There is absolutely nothing in the statement by Pope Pius IX to give the impression that a man could be saved apart from those factors which some writers of the time designated collectively as the "body" of the Church, just as there is nothing to indicate that he considered the possibility of "exceptions" to the sovereign rule of the Church's necessity for salvation.

There have been a few recent theologians who have attempted to explain the necessity of the Church exclusively, or at least primarily in terms of the "soul" of the Church. In this group we find the Spanish writer, Valentine Saiz-Ruiz, who insisted that the teaching "Outside the Church, no salvation," could be considered as absolutely true and could be fully grasped only when it is understood with reference to the Church's soul.[22] The Claretian, Michael Blanch, sets out to prove the thesis that "the Church is a necessary society, into which all men and all civil societies are bound to enter, and which they are bound to obey."[23] When he comes to discuss what is usually termed the "necessity of means," however, he speaks of "sanctifying grace, which is the soul of the Church," and makes no adequate reference to the necessity of any factor designated as the "body" or the visible aspect of the Church. One of the most striking instances of this mentality, however, is to be found in the influential English manual of sacred theology which Wilhelm and Scannell based upon the "dogmatik" of Scheeben. These writers conclude that "not every member of the Church is necessarily saved; and, on the other hand, some who belong only to the soul of the Church are saved."[24] The first portion of their conclusion is magnificently accurate. The second section, however, is inadequate in that it discounts the real necessity of the visible Church itself.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 335.

[22] *Synthesis sive notae theologiae fundamentalis* (Burgos, 1906), p. 328.

[23] *Theologia generalis seu tractatus de sacrae theologiae principiis* (Barcelona, 1901), p. 346.

[24] *A Manual of Catholic Theology*, 3rd edition (London: Kegan Paul 1908), II, 344.

We find a somewhat similar approach to the question in the recent treatise of Fr. Riccardo Lombardi. He teaches that the means of salvation willed by God is the Catholic Church, and the Catholic Church alone, in such a way that no man can be saved outside of it. He is convinced that the normal means of salvation is official membership in the visible Church. He also teaches, however, that there are many who belong to the soul of the Church who are not members of its body.[25] Thus, in the last analysis, it is the soul of the Church which is essential for salvation according to his doctrine.

Fr. A. J. Lutz also explains the Church's necessity in function of the "soul," but he makes this metaphor refer to God the Holy Ghost. This writer holds that "the Protestant in the state of grace is in reality a Catholic," by reason of what he considers the fact that "a person can be a member of the Church without being incorporated visibly into it." He continues: "What difference does it make if he thinks differently from the Catholics! We do not belong to Christ primarily by reason of our thought, but through His Spirit which gives us life."[26]

It would appear that this type of explanation of the Church's necessity serve to reduce this teaching to an empty formula. As it stands in the *Cantate Domino*, to take one example, the teaching on the necessity of the Church for salvation manifestly involves the fact that no one can attain to the beatific vision unless he attaches himself to the Church before the end of this mortal life. The teachings that stress the necessity of the Church's "soul," and which do not insist upon the necessity of the visible Church itself, leave one under the impression that union with or entrance into the visible and true Church need not be a matter of anxiety for anyone. Attachment to the Church is represented as something necessarily involved in the process of acquiring grace itself, and not as a matter of immediate urgency.

Some other strange methods of explaining the Church's necessity for salvation have been employed during the first half of the twentieth century. For example, Sertillanges, followed by Lippert, Michalon, and to a certain extent by Heris, gave the

[25] Cf. *La Salvezza di chi non ha fede*, 4th edition (Rome: Civiltà Cattolica, 1949), pp. 523, 574 f.

[26] *Jésus-Christ et les Protestants* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1939), p. 226.

impression that no man could be considered as completely outside the Catholic Church.[27] This teaching would certainly reduce the thesis on the Church's necessity to an empty formula, since it would imply that no man had any particular reason to adhere to the Church before his death, since he is in it necessarily and always.

Henri De Lubac taught that infidels can be saved, though not in the normal way of salvation, by reason of the mysterious bonds that join them to the faithful. He considers these individuals as contributing to the good of the Church through their efforts in building up and maintaining the various cultures in which the Church is meant to live and to praise God.[28] Thus, he believed that these men "can be saved because they constitute an integral part of the humanity that will be saved."[29] It was his contention that God, who wills that all men should be saved and who, in practice does not permit all men to be visibly in the Church, has nevertheless decreed that all who answer His call should be saved in some way through the Church.[30]

Yves De Montcheuil has followed and developed De Lubac's teaching. He has put on a level with the statement that there is no salvation outside the Church, the assertion that "no one anywhere, before or after Christ, will be condemned if he has not sinned against the light, if there is nothing culpable in the religious ignorance in which he finds himself."[31] In line with that contention, he taught that some of those to whom the Gospel has been preached and who have not accepted it must not be considered to have been lacking in good will.[32]

[27] Cf. Sertillanges, *The Church* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1922), p. 225; Lippert, *Die Kirche Christi* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1935), p. 271; Michalon, in his essay, "L'étendue de l'église," in the symposium *Église et unité* (Lille: Editions "Catholicité," 1948), p. 119; Héris, *L'église du Christ* (Juvisy: Éditions du Cerf, 1930), p. 21. Héris teaches that all the souls *susceptibles de recevoir la grâce* belong visibly or invisibly to the Church as they do to Christ.

[28] Cf. *Catholicisme*, 4th edition (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1947), pp. 193 f.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 194.

[30] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 195.

[31] *Aspects de l'église* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1949), p. 131.

[32] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 126.

Primarily, according to De Montcheuil, the formula "outside the Church no salvation" refers to the Church triumphant.[33] He has taught that non-believers, though not belonging visibly to the Church militant, must not be considered as absolutely without connection with it. They belong invisibly to the Church, not only because the grace by which they are saved is joined to the Church, but also because, even without knowing it, they are preparing the material of the Church in civilizations and in individuals.[34]

Another member of this same group, Jean Danielou, accepts and attributes to "most theologians" the belief that belonging to the visible Church is not an absolutely necessary condition for salvation, and holds we can think that souls of good will outside the Church are saved.[35] It does not seem that this type of explanation can legitimately be employed since the appearance of the *Humani generis.*

With these statements we must class the teachings of other writers, who have interpreted the statement that there is no salvation outside the Church in terms of an invisible Church. Thus Edward Ingram Watkin wrote that "it is therefore only the invisible Church whose membership is absolutely and without qualification necessary, since incorporation into the invisible Church is one and the same thing as supernatural union with God."[36] Astonishingly enough, Joseph Falcon, an apologist and theologian of deservedly high reputation, employs this terminology in the course of his own explanation of the Church's necessity for salvation. According to Falcon, the statement that there is no salvation outside the Church can be understood as a law or as the assertion of a fact. In the first case it simply marks the Church as something which is necessary with the necessity of precept. In the second, it applies to an invisible Church, whose members are to be found both within and outside of the visible society. Those who live outside the visible society "are only deprived, by

[33] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 132.

[34] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 135 f.

[35] Cf. *Le mystère du salut des nations* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1946), p. 138.

[36] In his essay, "The Church as the Mystical Body of Christ," in the symposium, *God and the Supernatural*, edited by Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1920), p. 266.

reason of their outward position, of the abundance of spiritual helps which are the privilege of this society."[37]

A rather considerable number of theologians, in explaining the Catholic Church's necessity for eternal salvation, employ the distinction between the "body" and the "soul" of the Church and state that it is necessary with the necessity of means to belong to the "soul," while it is necessary only with the necessity of precept to belong to the "body" of this society. The manuals of Cardinal Camillus Mazzella, and those of Marchini and of Prevel all offer this type of explanation.[38] The theory, however, has become linked to the name of Edouard Hugon, the great theologian of the Angelico, who developed it at some length in his monograph, *Hors de l'église, point de salut*. Hugon speaks of the obligation of belonging to the body of the Church, and of the necessity of pertaining to its soul.[39] Tepe, MacGuinness, Tanquerey, Hervé, Zubizarreta and Lahitton all employ the notions of "body" and "soul" in their explanations, but speak of attachment to both as necessary with the necessity of means.[40] They teach that salvation is possible only for those who are joined to the body of the Church either *in re* or *in voto*. Garrigou-Lagrange holds this same view, although his terminology agrees in some respects with that of Hugon.[41]

An astonishingly large number of theologians explain that the formula *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* in itself signifies that the Church is requisite for salvation with the necessity of precept,

[37] *La crédibilité du dogme catholique* (Lyons: Vitte, 1948), p. 488.

[38] Cf. Card. Mazzella, *De religione et ecclesia praelectiones scholastico-dogmaticae*, 6th edition (Prato, 1905), pp. 394 f.; Marchini, *Summula theologiae dogmaticae* (Vigevano, 1898), pp. 47 ff.; Prevel, *Theologiae dogmaticae elementa* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1912), I, 188 ff.; 194.

[39] *Hors de l'église point de salut*, 3rd edition (Paris: Téqui, 1927), pp. 153 ff.; 266 ff.

[40] Cf. Tepe, *Institutiones theologicae in usum scholarum* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1894), I, 361; Tanquerey, *Synopsis theologiae dogmaticae fundamentalis*, 24th edition, revised by Fr. Bord (Paris: Desclée, 1937), p. 555; Hervé, *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae* 18th edition (Paris: Berche et Pagis, 1939), I, 342; Zubizarreta, *Theologia dogmatico-scholastica ad mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis*, 3rd edition (Bilbao: Elèxpuru, 1937), I, 333; Lahitton, *Theologiae dogmaticae theses* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1932), III, 129-37.

[41] Cf. *De revelatione per ecclesiam catholicam proposita*, 4th edition (Rome: Ferrari, 1945), II, 407.

even though their own teaching on the Church's necessity for salvation takes cognizance of a real necessity of means. Egger, Brunsmann, and Van Noort, among others, claim that historically the axiom that there is no salvation outside the Church has reference to the necessity of precept.[42] Hurter, Ottiger, Schouppe, Casanova, and Orazio Mazzella all insist upon the necessity of precept, and despite the comparative complexity of his explanation, Pesch centers his teaching on this thesis around this same notion of the necessity of precept.[43] Herrmann, Dorsch, Hervé, and Calcagno all claim this as the meaning of the axiom, although they give a far stricter interpretation of the thesis itself.[44] Marengo interprets the axiom as signifying that those who belong in no way to the Church, or who do not belong to the body of the Church through their own fault, cannot be saved.[45] Michelitsch combines this teaching on the necessity of precept with the explanation that the Church is the ordinary means of salvation,[46] and the teaching of Bartmann on this thesis can be reduced to the same type of explanation.[47]

[42] Cf. Egger, *Enchiridion theologiae dogmaticae generalis*, 6th edition, (Brescia, 1932), p. 517; Brunsmann-Preuss, *A Handbook of Fundamental Theology* (St. Louis: Herder, 1931), III, 328; Van Noort, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi*, 5th edition by Fr. Verhaar (Hilversum: Brand, 1932), pp. 183 f.

[43] Cf. Hurter, *Theologiae dogmaticae compendium*, 2nd edition (Innsbruck: Wagner, 1878), I, 190; Ottiger, *Theologia fundamentalis* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1911), II, 261; Schouppe, *Elementa theologiae dogmaticae*, 22nd edition (Lyons: Delhomme et Briguet, 1861), I, 176; Casanova, *Theologia fundamentalis* (Rome, 1899), p. 254; Archbishop Orazio Mazzella, *Praelectiones scholastico dogmaticae*, 6th edition (Turin: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1944), I, 394.

[44] Cf. Herrmann, *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae*, 7th edition (Lyons: Vitte, 1937), I, 377; Dorsch, *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis*, 2nd edition (Innsbruck: Rauch, 1928), II, 539; Hervé, *op. cit.*, p. 345; Calcagno, *Theologia fundamentalis* (Naples: D'Auria, 1948), p. 169.

[45] Cf. *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis*, 3rd edition (Turin: Salesian Press, 1894), II, 251.

[46] Cf. *Elementa apologeticae sive theologiae fundamentalis*, 3rd edition (Graz: Styria, 1925), p. 278.

[47] Cf. Bartmann, *Précis de théologie dogmatique* (Mulhouse: Salvator, 1936), II, 166. Bartmann combines a teaching on the visible Church as necessary for salvation with a teaching on the absolute necessity of the "community of grace."

Among the ecclesiologists who have treated this question since the time of the Vatican Council, however, the group which is by far the most imposing, in numbers, in authority, and in the attention they have devoted to this thesis, is that of the men who have taught that the Church itself is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means. Franzelin and Hunter added the explanation that it is possible to belong to the visible Church invisibly.[48] Crosta spoke of the possibility of being in the Church either *corde seu affective* or *corpore seu effective*.[49] Most of the others have followed the example of Billot, Palmieri, Lambrecht, and Straub, and have explained that it is possible to be saved if one is within the Church *in re* or *in voto*.[50]

Casanova, Herrmann, Schultes, Egger, and Calcagno all base their explanation of the thesis on this form of teaching, although they weaken it to some extent by introducing other elements into it.[51] Among the great twentieth-century manuals of ecclesiology, those of Dieckmann, D'Herbigny, Bainvel, Lercher, De Guibert, and Felder insist that the Church itself is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means.[52] The teaching of Manzoni, though

[48] Cf. Franzelin, *Theses de ecclesia Christi* (Rome, 1887), p. 424; Hunter, *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology*, 3rd edition (New York: Benziger, 1894), I, 255.

[49] Cf. *Theologia dogmatica*, 3rd edition (Gallarate, 1932), I, 195.

[50] Cf. Billot, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi*, 5th edition (Rome: Gregorian University, 1927, I, 117 ff.; Palmieri, *Tractatus de Romano Pontifice cum prolegomeno de ecclesia*, 2nd edition (Prato, 1891), pp. 15 ff.; Lambrecht, *Demonstratio catholica seu tractatus de ecclesia* (Ghent, 1890), p. 30; Straub, *De ecclesia Christi* (Innsbruck, 1894), pp. 233 ff.

[51] Cf. Casanova, *op. cit.*, p. 254; Herrmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 372 ff.; Schultes, *De ecclesia catholica praelectiones apologeticae* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1931), pp. 267 ff.; Egger, *op. cit.*, pp. 514 ff.; Calcagno, *op. cit.*, 166 ff.

[52] Cf. Dieckmann, *De ecclesia tractatus historico-dogmatici* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1925), II, 252 f.; D'Herbigny, *Theologica de Ecclesia*, 3rd edition (Paris: Beauchesne, 1927), I, 149 ff. X; Bainvel, *De ecclesia Christi* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1925), pp. 88 ff.; Lercher, *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae*, 2nd edition (Innsbruck: Rauch, 1934), I, 441 ff.; De Guibert, *De Christi ecclesia*, 2nd edition (Rome: Gregorian University, 1928), pp. 155 ff.; Felder, *Apologetica sive theologia fundamentalis*, 2nd edition (Paderborn, 1923), II, 18 ff. Felder speaks of participation in the Church as the *condicio sine qua nemo salvatur*.

somewhat less developed, must also be interpreted in this sense.[53] The recent treatises of Vellico, Zapelena, Parente, Philips, and Graham are all explicit on this point.[54] The thesis is developed in this same line in the special works of Bainvel, Caperan, and Dublanchy.[55] De Groot and Berry both speak of membership in the Church as necessary *in re* or *in voto*.[56]

The idea that a *votum*, that is a desire or an intention, of entering the Church can bring a man "within" the Church sufficiently to allow for the possibility of his salvation is one of the dominant factors in recent theological writing on the Church's necessity. The notion itself is a part of Catholic doctrinal tradition, although this particular terminology, or, to be more exact, the application of this terminology to the thesis that there is no salvation outside the Church, goes back only to the latter part of the sixteenth century, to the time of Stapleton and St. Robert.[57] Now the idea, and to a lesser extent the terminology itself, is definitely a standard part of the scholastic treatment of this thesis.

Likewise, and by force of the very content of Catholic theology, it is standard scholastic teaching that the *votum* or desire of entering the Catholic Church may be merely implicit and still sufficient to bring a man "within" the Church so as to make his

[53] Cf. *Compendium theologiae dogmaticae*, 4th edition (Turin, 1928), I, 184.

[54] Cf. Vellico, *De ecclesia Christi tractatus apologetico-dogmaticus* (Rome: Arnodo, 1940), pp. 457-64; Zapelena, *De ecclesia Christi* (Rome: Gregorian University, 1940), II, 152 ff.; Parente, *Theologia fundamentalis* (Turin: Marietti, 1946), pp. 129 ff.; Philips, *La sainte église catholique* (Tournai: Casterman, 1947), pp. 262 ff.; Graham, "The Church on Earth," in *The Teaching of the Catholic Church*, edited by Canon Smith (New York: Macmillan, 1949), II, 709 f.

[55] Cf. Bainvel, *Is there Salvation outside the Catholic Church?* (St. Louis: Herder, 1920), pp. 25 ff.; Caperan, *Le problème du salut des infidèles: Essai théologique*, 2nd edition (Toulouse: Grand Séminaire, 1934), pp. 103 ff.; Dublanchy, "Église," in *DTC*, IV, 2166 ff.

[56] Cf. De Groot, *Summa apologetica de ecclesia catholica*, 3rd edition (Regensburg, 1906), p. 142; Berry, *The Church of Christ*, 2nd edition (St. Louis: Herder, 1927), p. 235.

[57] Stapleton seems to have been the first to employ this terminology with reference to the necessity of the Church, in his *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium demonstratio methodica* (Paris, 1579), p. 314. St. Robert employed it in his *De ecclesia militante*, in the Ingolstadt edition of the Controversies (1586 edition), col. 1206.

salvation possible. Salvific faith must be explicit on four points. No man can believe in God as he must believe in order to possess the life of sanctifying grace without distinctly acknowledging the existence of God as the Head of the supernatural order, the fact that God thus rewards the good and punishes the evil, the mystery of the Blessed Trinity, and the mystery of the Incarnation. The mystery of the Catholic Church is not one of these facts which must be believed explicitly in salvific faith.

In the magazine *From the Housetops*, Mr. Raymond Karam wrote that, in order to be saved, a person "must have an explicit will to join the Catholic Church."[58] If this statement were true, then it would follow that practically all that has been written in the literature of scholastic theology on the necessary explicit content of salvific faith since that question was first considered in the schools would be lamentably incorrect. What Mr. Karam presents as an expression of pure Catholic doctrine proves, upon examination, to be merely another tentative in opposition to received ecclesiastical teaching.

The statement that the Church (not merely the "soul" or the "body" of the Church) is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means in such a way that no man can be saved unless he is within the Church either *in re* or by either an explicit or an implicit *votum* must be considered as an accurate statement of the revealed teaching on the Church's necessity for eternal salvation and as the standard terminology of most modern theologians on this subject. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that this mode of expression is not completely adequate, and that it does not entirely close off the possibility of a seriously erroneous perspective in this section of sacred doctrine. One example may suffice to show how this terminology may be abused.

When we assert that the Catholic Church is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means, in such a way that a man must belong to it *in re* or *in voto* if he is to attain to the beatific vision, there is a danger that we may be misunderstood and that people may consider the appurtenance to the Church *in voto* as the thing that really counts, and think of belonging to the Church *in re*, that is, actually being a member of the true and visible Church of Jesus Christ, as something more or less accidental

in the schema of the supernatural order. Unfortunately there have been and there still are individuals who look upon the Church as really necessary only for the complete fulness of those revealed truths and other supernatural aids which, according to their teaching, can be obtained outside the Church and independently of it less perfectly, although still to an extent sufficient to make salvation possible. Obviously such an interpretation of the Church's necessity for salvation reduces this teaching to a mere empty formula.

It remains now to consider briefly the explanations of the Church's necessity which involve the use of the terms "soul" and "body" of the Church. There is a definite tendency among modern writers to recognize the radical inadequacy of this terminology.[59] Furthermore, it is interesting to note that the Holy Father, in his encyclical *Mystici Corporis*, did not employ it at all in his statements on the subject of the Church's necessity.[60]

The terminology, it must be admitted, had the advantage of taking cognizance of the fact that the life of grace and of charity, and the activity of faith itself, really belong to the Church, and of inculcating the truth that the three theological virtues, together with the other infused virtues and the gifts of the Holy Ghost, are actually the internal bond of union within the visible Church itself. It had, however, the tremendous disadvantage of leading to the inference that the internal bond of union within the Church could be regarded as requisite for salvation without any sufficient or adequate reference to the outward bond or to the visible Church itself. As it has been employed in the scholastic thesis on the necessity of the Church, this terminology has served to obscure the understanding of the divinely revealed truth on this subject, rather than effectively to explain it.

The assertion that the axiom "no salvation outside the Church" refers to the soul of the Church alone, and the teaching that the soul of the Church alone is necessary with the necessity of means,

[58] Raymond Karam, in "Reply to a Liberal," in *From the Housetops*, III, 3 (Spring, 1949), 61.

[59] Cf. Caperan, *op. cit.*, 104 f.; Philips, *op. cit.*, pp. 276 ff.

[60] The encyclical speaks of those non-members of the Church who are "within" it according to the sense of the axiom, not as belonging to the soul of the Church, but as ordered *"inscio quodam desiderio ac voto ad mysticum Redemptoris Corpus."*

have contributed in large measure to the imperfect teaching on this subject which the Holy Father deplores and reproves in the *Humani generis*. The forthcoming section of this article will attempt to show, from the history of this treatise in scholastic theology, how such an effect has been achieved.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

AN ANNOUNCEMENT

Beginning with this issue, the liturgical portions of the "Answers to Questions" will be written by the Rev. Dr. Walter J. Schmitz, S.S. The Rev. Dr. William J. Lallou, who has taken care of this work since the headquarters of the *Review* were moved to the University over seven years ago, is now the pastor of the parish of Our Lady of Lourdes in Philadelphia. His present duties have made it impossible for him to continue his regular monthly contributions to this periodical. In expressing our profound gratitude to Dr. Lallou for all that he and his delightfully urbane and erudite writings have done for *AER* during the years just past, we of the staff venture the hope that we may have the privilege of publishing material written by him during the days to come.

Dr. Schmitz has signally favored the *Review*, by consenting to take charge of the liturgical questions addressed to it. His profound understanding of things liturgical and his talent for clear and practical explanation make him a writer of outstanding value in this field.

Incidentally, both of our liturgical experts represent outstanding traditions in the history of the *Review*. Dr. Lallou, like Dr. Heuser, the founder of the *Review*, and like so many of its great writers, is a priest of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. Like Dr. Hogan, whose contributions to this magazine in the early days are still ranked among the best that have ever appeared on these pages, Dr. Schmitz is a member of the Society of St. Sulpice.

J. C. F.

Answers to Questions

A REMEDY FOR HEADACHES

Question: A remedy for headaches has recently been brought to my notice. The special feature of this remedy, as far as priests are concerned, is that it seems to produce its effect without breaking the eucharistic fast. It consists of a tablet that is placed under the tongue and is directly absorbed through the skin of the mouth into the blood stream. There is a small amount of residue, which can be expectorated. Could this remedy—known as Theryl—be taken by a priest before the celebration of Mass?

Answer: If the remedy acts as the questioner describes, his conclusion would seem to be correct. Apparently, this headache remedy is in the same category as nitroglycerine tablets for a heart attack, which, according to a view previously expressed in this column (*AER*, CXIV, 3 [March, 1946], 228), do not break the eucharistic fast, because they produce their beneficial effect by acting directly through membranes of the mouth. If the headache remedy called Theryl acts in the same way, it seems quite safe to hold that a priest suffering from a headache before Mass (and there are many priests afflicted in this way when they celebrate at a late hour) may use this remedy with the assurance that he is not breaking the eucharistic fast.

THE MARRIAGE OF A PARAPLEGIC

Question: Nowadays, with the number of persons known as paraplegics ever increasing, the problem of the marriage of such a person is frequently presented to the priest. If a priest is asked to officiate at the marriage of a paraplegic, what course should he follow?

Answer: The chief difficulty connected with the marriage of a paraplegic centers about the question whether one who is afflicted in this manner has the physical requirements for a valid marriage. According to Catholic teaching, one who is permanently impotent prior to marriage is incapable by the law of nature of contracting

a valid marriage (Can. 1068, §1). The impotence is relative if the individual is incapable of normal sexual relations with only a certain person or certain persons of the opposite sex; it is absolute if he is unable to have normal sexual relations with any one. In the case of paraplegics the problem generally concerns absolute impotence. There seems to be a wide-spread belief that men afflicted with paraplegia are completely and permanently impotent.

However, Dr. Herbert Talbot, in a recent study of this problem, concludes that a considerable number of paraplegics retain the physical power of sexual intercourse and consequently are capable of contracting a valid marriage (*Journal of Urology*, LXI, 2 [February, 1949] 265-70). About ten per cent of those who came under his observation actually accomplished complete intercourse, and he believes that the percentage of those who are able to do so is much greater, though evidence was not available since three-quarters of the men were in the hospital and many were unmarried. His general conclusion is that paraplegics should not be dismissed as permanently impotent.

In view of such data, it is surely not within the province of the priest to inform a paraplegic that he may not attempt marriage merely because of the nature of his disease. For, according to the ruling of the Church: "If the impediment of impotence is doubtful, whether by doubt of law or by doubt of fact, a marriage is not to be prevented" (Can. 1068, §2). Evidently, a doubt of fact must be presumed in the case of every paraplegic. Hence, in the event that a man with this affliction applies for marriage in the Catholic Church, competent medical testimony should be sought, in the hope that the doubt can be settled. It might even be prudent to seek the decision of more than one doctor, at least in the event that the first judgment is unfavorable. Needless to say, no immoral means of resolving the doubt should be taken. If, after an investigation, the impotency remains doubtful, the marriage should be permitted. It is only when there is certainty that the individual is impotent that the priest may refuse to officiate at his marriage.

THE FIRST SANCTIFICATION OF ST. JOSEPH

Question: Is there any probability to the opinion that St. Joseph, like Our Lady, was preserved from original sin?

Answer: It is difficult to see how such an opinion could be defended. For, the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus* in which Pope Pius IX solemnly defined the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin explicitly stated that this privilege of Mary was unique (*singulari*). From this we can logically conclude that she was the only descendant of Adam (excepting, of course, the Word Incarnate) who was never defiled by original sin. According to Cardinal Lépicier (*Institutiones theologiae speculativae* [Rome, 1932], II, 389), the opinion that St. Joseph was granted the privilege of an immaculate conception would be rash and suspected of heresy. However, some hold as probable that St. Joseph was sanctified before birth, though there is nothing in Scripture or Tradition to provide a strong argument for this view (cf. Hervé, *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae* [Paris, 1935], II, n. 677).

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

FORTY HOURS' DEVOTION PROBLEMS

Question: (1) Is it required to consecrate a new host for exposition or may we use the one already in the lunette? If so, may it be reposed in the tabernacle after the solemn exposition of the Blessed Sacrament? (2) Is there any specific legislation about the Litany being sung on the morning of exposition and the hour of reposition?

Answer: (1) Most of the authorities direct us to consecrate a separate host for exposition of the Blessed Sacrament during Forty Hours' Devotion. However, Wapelhorst in a footnote in his *Compendium sacrae liturgiae* tells us that this is not a matter of precept and that the consecrated host already reserved may be used for exposition during this time of public adoration. The Clementine Instruction as well as ceremonial handbooks tell us that the Sacred Host which was used for exposition should be consumed by a celebrant in a subsequent Mass.

(2) Fr. Unger in his excellent *Handbook for Forty Hours' Adoration* informs us specifically that "two chanters kneeling in the center of the sanctuary (provided they are in surplice) lead the Litany; if no chanters are present, the celebrant (and ministers) lead it." Many priests feel, and perhaps rightly so, that the *recitation* of the Litany would be preferred, both for the sake

of devotion of the participating faithful, and because of the difficulty, in some circumstances, of a proper musical rendition of the Litany. However, none of the authors recommend the recitation of the Litany. On the contrary they insist on the sung Litany, even in their list of modifications applicable to Forty Hours' Devotion.

CROSSES ON CORPORALS AND PURIFICATORS

Question: What ornamentation may we have on the corporal and purificator? Is it necessary to have a cross on them and if so what color should it be?

Answer: Approved authors direct and recommend a small cross to be worked or woven in the corporal and purificator. However, this is not prescribed by the rubrics. Red is the suggested color for the cross.

Dom Roulin's remarks on this problem will prove interesting reading to some of the clergy. "A very small cross in red thread, in marking-stitch for instance, and as flat as possible, indicates the side which should be towards the celebrant. A good deal of ingenuity has been expended on designing and publishing minute crosses of a definitely Gothic style, which, it is claimed, are very suitable for this important cloth. But this is mere trifling and finicality. Let us see to it that we have a small cross of the ordinary shape (crux immissa) or another, for corporal, pall and purificator, and that will be quite satisfactory. We speak in various chapters of ornament which is out of place on these cloths and of lace which gets in the way of the priest's fingers and becomes horribly rumpled. Let us add that particles of the host may strike against these little decorations or stick in the lace."

Dom Anselm Veys in *L'Ouvroir* has a very good note on the corporal, pall, and finger-cloth. "To refrain from ornamenting these three cloths," he says, "is from every point of view beyond reproach. But why then vacillate presently and allow intricate little decorations, even indeed of cotton lace. If these cloths without such decorations are irreproachable, then let us have the courage not to accept what is open to reproach. The better course is here a very easy course."

REBURIAL REQUIEM MASS

Question: A young man in our parish has been killed in the service. His remains are being sent home for burial. A requiem Mass was said by his chaplain for the temporary burial. What Mass am I to say when his body arrives home for final interment?

Answer: We are informed by rubricians that when a body is transferred from a temporary grave to a permanent one, a Requiem Mass is permitted, the same conditions prevailing as for the Requiem Mass after the announcement of a death. The fact that the Exequial Mass may have been offered at the time of the temporary burial does not exclude it at the time of the second and final burial. The formulary and rite will be the same as *in die obitus.*

SOLEMN VOTIVE MASS OF THANKSGIVING

Question: We are preparing for a parish celebration and are planning with the permission of the Ordinary to have a solemn votive Mass of thanksgiving. Kindly inform me what precise Mass we will say on that Sunday.

Answer: Provided the Sunday does not forbid a solemn votive Mass, you may choose almost any Mass. Usually, for this votive Mass of thanksgiving, priests select the votive Mass of the Trinity, of the Holy Spirit or of our Blessed Lady. However, you are free to offer the Mass of any saint. To the prayers of the Mass selected, you are obliged to add under one conclusion the three special prayers of thanksgiving which are found in the Missal at the end of the votive Masses and immediately before the *orationes diversae.* After these prayers, you will add the oration of the Sunday and then the *oratio imperata* if it is *pro re grave.* The last gospel will not be of St. John but the gospel assigned for that particular Sunday.

FOLDED CHASUBLES

Question: I have received an order for folded chasubles. The priest ordering them wants them in all colors but I feel he is incorrect since I have only seen them worn during Lent and

Advent. Kindly let me know if there is use for these in the various colors.

Answer: The folded chasubles are used only on certain penitential days and during Advent and Lent. In all these cases purple or violet vestments are used and so the good Father would not have use for such vestments in any other colors. At a solemn High Mass when folded chasubles are not available, the deacon is to appear in alb, maniple, and stole, while the subdeacon wears the alb and maniple.

WASHING HANDS AT THE LAVABO

Question: At the lavabo of a Low Mass does the celebrant wash all the fingers? My altar boys are small so I have them present a bowl already filled with water. Is this permitted?

Answer: We are instructed at the lavabo to hold the tips of the thumbs and the index fingers of both hands, over the finger bowl so that the altar boy can pour the water over them. The *Ritus servandi* of the Missal directs the altar boy to pour the water over the fingers of the celebrant. This rubric cannot be fulfilled if he presents a small vessel already containing water for the purification of the fingers of the celebrant.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

THE FOLLOWING OF MARY

In Mary we see how a truly good and provident God has established for us a most suitable example of every virtue. As we look upon her and think about her, we are not cast down as though stricken by the overpowering splendor of God's power; but, on the contrary, attracted by the closeness of the common nature we share with her, we strive with greater confidence to imitate her. If we, with her powerful help, should dedicate ourselves wholly and entirely to this undertaking, we can form at least an outline of such great virtue and sanctity and, reproducing that perfect conformity of our lives to all God's designs which she possessed in so marvelous a degree, we shall follow her into heaven.

—Pope Leo XIII, in the encyclical *Magnae Dei matris*, issued Sept. 8, 1892. The passage is found in Fr. Lawler's collection *The Rosary of Mary* (Paterson, N. J.: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1943), pp. 88 f.

Book Reviews

RELIGIONS OF THE FAR EAST. By George C. Ring, S.J. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1950. Pp. x + 350. $6.00.

The man who undervalues the industrious compiler is both ungenerous and unwise, for while the one carps the other is putting many in his debt. Fr. Ring of St. Louis University follows his study of the near eastern religions exclusive of Judaism (*Gods of the Gentiles* [Bruce, 1938]), with a useful companion volume on the major religions of the world east of Istanbul. Actually his treatment is according to cultural influence rather than strict geographical provenance, as the major headings indicate: China, Japan, India, Buddhism, and Islam. Tao, Confucianism, Shinto, and the religions of the Jain and Hindu are classified within that scheme. His bibliography of largely English titles contains nonetheless many translations of original sources, the recognized western authorities on religions of the east, and expositions of the various religions by apologetes and practitioners.

The author is constrained to a telescoping of national and ethnic histories as necessary preliminaries, destined to pain the experts no matter how skillfully done. One must choose. The task of exclusion is mammoth and what is left is good for the purpose. It would be a huge oversight to neglect the "end that determines an indifferent means" in this case. Up to this writing, readers of English have had no single handbook to present comparatively the ancient eastern beliefs against a background of Catholic belief. The occasionally over-argued Catholic Truth Society "Studies in Comparative Religion" were for years alone in the popular field and to many unavailable; and this while hundreds of thousands of college and university students were being subjected to faith-sapping courses in Frazer, shamanism, and the tribal veneration of the Old Man. Fr. Ring does not attempt to establish religious origins inferentially. He is content with the historical record. Occasionally he will suggest a primitive monotheism or morality of loftier type if the evidence or the judgment of cultural anthropologists warrants it. Otherwise he simply reports what the orientals have said and believed.

The section on Islam should have a particular interest for priests with their background of Scripture study. It is pitiful to read of the loss to Christ, in God's mysterious design, of the million followers of him who could hopefully write in his *Koran*, ". . . the most inclinable to entertain friendship for the true believers [are those] who say: We

are Christians. This cometh to pass because there are priests and monks among them, and because they are not elated with pride."

GERARD S. SLOYAN

THE WAY OF DIVINE LOVE. By Sister Josefa Menendez. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1950. Pp. 532. $4.25.

The study of theology alone, enlightening as it is, is not sufficient food for the soul. Jesus Christ is more than a truth; He is also a Person with the richness of personality of One who is Love. We need, then, also all the helps that will lead us to a real assent, of mind and heart and will, to all that He is. This volume—a substantial enlargement of one published ten years ago—is decidedly one of those helps. For it presents the living Christ in a way that goes direct to the heart. It is the story of the revelations made by the Sacred Heart to Sister Josefa Menendez over a period of three years.

The prime emphasis is upon the message. Sister Josefa is kept in the background. In fact, it is puzzling that she should be named as author when she is merely the writer of the notes upon which the book is based. She was born in Spain in 1890, had a normal childhood, save for the poverty and sufferings common to many of God's chosen ones. She became a religious of the Sacred Heart in 1920, at the age of 29, at Les Feuillants, France. Toward the end of her postulancy, she began to experience supernatural visitations. Finally, after almost incredible sufferings, she died on Dec. 29, 1923.

The message can scarcely be summarized in one sentence. It gathers force and color only from the context: the daily repetition, the various circumstances in which it was given, the crescendo of tenderness with which the Sacred Heart applied it to Sister Josefa herself. The following quotation will indicate its main outlines: "My Heart is not only an abyss of love. It is also an abyss of mercy; and knowing as I do that even My closest friends are not exempt from human frailties, I will that each of their actions, however insignificant, be clothed through Me with immense value for the help of those in need and for the salvation of sinners. . . . All, yes, all can make My Heart known and loved. . . . I will make use of their very wretchedness, their frailties, even of their falls, for the salvation of souls" (p. 239).

Sister Josefa had what we may call a true mystical personality. First, there seems to be evidence that a great and good Force drew her to superhuman heights, and led her through all the stages clearly marked by the masters. Secondly, she manifested a humility whose depth can be compared to the mystical annihilation of a Catherine of Siena, a John of the Cross, or a Paul of the Cross. Third, she ever

practiced a docile obedience that marked her as a true child of the Church and of her Congregation. Fourth, there is an unerring accuracy and integrity in her words that reveals the influence of the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. And finally, there is a sane balance throughout her writings that ever steers surely between superstition and abstraction, pessimism and smugness, harshness and sentimentality.

All in all, an attentive reading of this book leads this reviewer to believe—pending the judgment of the Church—that Sister Josefa's words are an authentic and urgent appeal direct from the Sacred Heart for love and reparation. The book should satisfy the needs of moderns for a way to peace, for there is no prescription that can improve on the age-old one: "Come to Me, all you who labor and are heavily burdened, and I will give rest to your souls."

Too many of us, perhaps, tend to think of Christianity only in terms of its social effectiveness in history. As a reaction to excessive individualism, this is good. But if it depersonalizes our relations with God, if it undermines our approach to Christ's humanity, then, we need this message of the Sacred Heart. We must not be merely individuals, we who are members one of another in Christ; we must never forget that we best fulfill our social destiny by perfecting our personalities through an intimate union with Him who is center of all hearts, the Saviour and Spouse of souls.

SIMON P. WOOD, C.P.

THE ESCHATOLOGY OF ST. JEROME. By John P. O'Connell (Mundelein, Ill.: Seminary of St. Mary of the Lake, 1948). Pp. x + 199.

Fr. O'Connell's volume on St. Jerome's eschatology is a thorough study of a rather tricky subject. Jerome himself was not too sure of just where he stood in regard to the four last things, and in particular, with regard to the everlasting endurance of hell. This was because he was so dependent upon Origen for most of his theological thought once he had made contact with the Alexandrian genius. Hence, Jerome never really solved the case for himself, and in controversy doubled back on himself several times.

In dealing with the subject of a possible mitigation of the everlasting punishment of hell that is to be met with in Jerome, Fr. O'Connell has selected the terms "mercyism" and "mercyist" which, despite the explanatory note on ix, are quite unfortunate. Likewise, the fact that the dissertation was completed in 1945 explains the failure to take into consideration further work done since then on Jerome and his opponents in the Origenistic controversies; though certainly the author should have paid some attention to M. Villain's article "La querelle

autour d'Origène" in *Recherches de science religieuse*, xxxvii (1937), 171-80.

As a theological monograph, the book is a good, convenient collection of Jerome's thoughts on eschatology, with a well argued commentary. But it would certainly have been better and fairer to have examined more closely into Rufinus' charges, quoting the latter in his *Apologia* on the matter of the resurrection, etc. As Cavallera has pointed out (*S. Jérôme, sa vie et son oeuvre*, II (Paris, 1922), 97-101), Rufinus is much more trustworthy than Jerome when it comes to citing testimony and recalling statements and facts.

Fr. O'Connell's conclusion, as he himself states, does leave the reader up in the air as to whether Jerome was a "mercyist" or not. From a scholarly, theological viewpoint, it might have been better to have attempted a wider and more satisfactory treatment by recounting the thinking on this subject of Jerome's western contemporaries as well.

FRANCIS X. MURPHY, C.SS.R.

L'ASCESE MONASTIQUE DE SAINT BASILE: ESSAI HISTORIQUE. By Dom David Amand, O.S.B. Maredsous, 1948. Pp. xxvi + 364.

Dom David Amand has given us here a thorough treatise on the ascetical thinking of the great Cappadocian, St. Basil, as found in his monastic enterprises and rules. It was a work that needed doing in such fashion since Basil's influence on the West, primarily through the translations of his *Rules* by Rufinus proved so strong a factor in the development of western monasticism, reaching in particular into Benedict's founding ideals. Preceding monographs, though handy—particularly those of W. K. L. Clarke and Sr. Margaret Murphy, along with P. Humbertclaude's "doctrine ascetique"—were felt to have been inadequate. Now we have a well integrated, theologically sound resifting of all of Basil's ideas in relation to the ascetical life of a monk.

It is good to find Dom Amand filling in the *lacunae* left by Humbertclaude's failure to take into consideration the influence of Hellenistic and stoic ascesis on a man so steeped in classical training and tradition as was Saint Basil.

Dom Amand's book, if anything, is almost too exhaustive in its sifting—and this is felt most acutely because of the failure to include an index, though a brave attempt was made to magnify the table of contents into a substitute. Needless to remark, the author is well abreast of the literature on both Basil and monasticism from Kranich and Loofs to Holl and Giet. He includes a prefatory note on the

authenticity of the ascetical works of his subject (pp. xxv-xxvi); but it might have been more helpful had he anticipated some of the conclusions of his confrere, F. M. Guetet, in resolving the main problems presented by the ms. tradition regarding the authenticity of the *Regulae fusius* and *brevius tractatae*, and in spending some time on an evaluation of the conclusions reached by F. Laun in his "Die beiden Regeln des Basilius" in *Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte* xliv (1925), 13 ff. For it is in the *Rules* that Basil's ascetical thought is most clearly and distinctly reflected.

FRANCIS X. MURPHY, C.SS.R.

THE WAY TO PEACE ON EARTH

We know very well that human resources are incapable of bringing this about; for the minds of men must be renewed, their evil tendencies must be repressed, and hatreds must be overcome, the standards of justice must truly be put into practice, men must work towards a more equable distribution of wealth, mutual charity must be stirred up again, and all must be encouraged in the line of virtuous activity. For bringing about this great effect, there is obviously nothing of greater help and value than the Christian religion. Its divine doctrines teach us that, as brothers, men compose one family, and that God is the Father of that family, Christ its Redeemer and the One who brings it divine grace, and that the never-failing homeland of this family is heaven. If these divine teachings are actually carried into practice, then certainly war, discord, disorder, and violations of civil and religious liberty will not come to trouble the course of public and private life, but there will be tranquil serenity based on justice suffused through the minds and hearts of men and a safe way to a continually increasing prosperity will be opened.

—The Holy Father in his encyclical *Mirabile illud*, issued Dec. 6, 1950.

Book Notes

The Way of the Mystics, by H. C. Graef (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1948. Pp. vi + 160. $2.75). The Newman Bookshop is to be commended for making available to American Catholics such a valuable yet compendious volume on the mystical life. By way of introduction, the author points out some of the theological foundations of mysticism, insisting that the mystic state is ". . . really nothing but . . . [the] 'normal' development of the virtues and the gifts." He points out too that the extraordinary phenomena that sometimes accompany the mystic state are not of its essence, but are rather *gratiae gratis datae* that are present in evidence of the unusual degree of virtue the mystic has achieved. The point of view taken is that mysticism is the normal development of the ordinary life of grace. The author examines the lives of fifteen of the more prominent mystics, one from almost every walk of life. He concisely, though quite completely, touches on the salient details in the lives of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, St. Hildegard, St. Catherine of Siena, Blessed Anna Taigi; the Dominicans: Master Eckhart, John Tauler, and Blessed Henry Suso; the Franciscans: St. Bonaventure, Blessed Angela de Foligno, and Louise Lateau; St. Gertrude, St. Margaret Mary, St. Teresa of Avila, St. Francis de Sales, and finally St. John of the Cross. After the account of their lives and works, Graef points out by way of conclusion that the two great realities in their lives were prayer and penance. As unpopular as they are in the modern world, these "two great realities" are necessary, for "prayer and penance are the two mainsprings of the spiritual life . . . and not prayer only, but the salt of prayer, which is penance."

A sermon book that should find popular acceptance among the clergy is *In Praise of Our Lady,* by Martin Dempsey (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., 1950. Pp. vi + 225). Among the sermons is a special series suitable for a novena to Our Lady of Fatima. The sermons in this series were so well received when preached by Fr. Dempsey that he was urged to publish them. The result is this unique volume, the first of its kind, based on the apparitions of Fatima. The other sermons in the book are appropriate for the major feasts of Our Lady during the year. The book contains such sermons as Our Lady of Lourdes, The Immaculate Heart of Mary, The Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, Our Lady of Ransom, The Most Holy Rosary, The Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, The Immaculate Conception, etc. In the section comprising the novena to Our Lady of Fatima are such sermon topics as The Setting of the Shrine at Fatima, Our Lady of Faith, Prophecy, Prayer, Power, Peace, Mother of Pity, and Our Lady of the Citadel. The research involved in collecting the facts about Fatima makes these sermons particularly acceptable.

Robert Nash, S.J. presents another volume to the library of the Spiritual Book Associates, this one a book of meditations entitled *Thy Light and Thy Truth* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1948. p. 197. $2.50), a companion volume to his former work *Send Forth Thy Light.* In keeping with the method of mental prayer of St. Ignatius Loyola, the author makes use of the following scheme in developing each meditation: Preparatory prayer, Setting, Fruit, Points, Summary, and Tessera. The author strongly advises that one or more of the points in the scheme be omitted if found cumbersome. He quotes Archbishop Goodier's advice to ". . . pray in the way that you find best." Each meditation is designed to furnish sufficient matter for several morning's prayer. In all, there are twenty-one topics for meditation dealing

with some of the more important points in the spiritual life. Among the topics covered are found meditations on Our Lord, Mary, the moral life, communion of saints, the model priest, sin, etc. The book generally seems to fulfill its avowed purpose quite admirably, that of stimulating "thoughts that will afford subject matter for conversation with God in prayer."

Fr. McSorley's recent book *Meditations for Everyman*, II (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company, 1948. Pp. vi + 211. $2.75) completes his series of meditations for every day in the year. The present volume covers the time from Pentecost to Advent. Each meditation is constructed around a text from one of the gospels, often from the gospel of the Sunday Mass for that week. Some attempt has been made to have all the meditations for any one week deal with one particular topic; but the author himself notes in the Introduction that the effort has not always been successful. The unique quality of the gospel texts used is that they are the direct words of Our Lord Himself. The meditations which Fr. McSorley develops from Christ's words are sound and rather matter of fact. The personal work of affections is kept personal; but ample matter is offered to make the meditations eminently fruitful. The volume includes an index of gospel texts which can be used as a précis of any one week's meditations. The title does well to indicate that the book is for "Everyman." For those advanced in mental prayer it offers a starting point from which they may delve into the inexhaustibly fruitful gospel message, while it has sufficient detail to be valuable for the beginner.

The B. Herder Publishing Co. of St. Louis has recently brought out a book entitled: *Message of Christ*, by Rev. Rudolph Donders. It is a better than average collection of sermon sketches which are arranged according to the ecclesiastical year and based largely on the Gospels. Although one will come across very few new ideas in this large volume of 469 pages, he will meet with sound doctrine, well ordered into logical divisions for oral presentation. Each sketch is so divided that it may be used for a full length sermon or for a five minute homily. The priest who is looking for some assistance in preparing his sermons will find it in this volume. The book sells for $6.00.

The Newman Press has reprinted Hartmann Grisar's *Martin Luther, His Life and Work* (Adapted from the second German edition by Frank J. Eble. Westminster, Md., 1950. Pp. x +609. $4.75), a quarter century after its first appearance. It is a condensation of a three-volume work done in 1911-12, and has the annoying feature of referring the reader to the original in place of many citations to Luther and scholarly works concerning him. The Jesuit author is a careful historian but an apologist and mild polemicist as well. It is unfortunate because so needless. While Grisar's account is documented and reliable, his interpretation demands revision by the reader in many cases. Current popular titles on Luther could use this strong contender untinged by righteousness. The intelligent reader will know how to glean its worth.

History has known few women so universally attractive as Mary Stuart (for Ronsard, "O belle, et plus que belle!"; for Randolph Elizabeth's spying ambassador, "the finest shee that ever was"). When Christendom records deaths holy as hers, "who made herself unready with a kind of gladness and smiling," it usually names the persons saints. Katherine Brégy has fallen in love with Mary of Scotland, like all her biographers, in *Queen of Paradox* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1950. Pp. xiv + 221. $3.00). Her use of sources is good and her manner, as ever, engaging. Mary's life of frustration, her poor judgment of men and single lapse from grace, her encompassing lovableness, shine pleasantly through an incredibly careless typography.

Unto the Altar, by Fr. Joseph V. Duenser, C.PP.S., is a collection of the sermons preached by the author at a retreat for priests in the Archdiocese of Santa Fe. It carries a fine introduction by the Most Reverend Archbishop of that See. Those who are called upon to prepare retreats for their sacerdotal brethren, and those who seek a good book of meditations on the priestly life, particularly on the life of priests engaged in the parochial ministry, will derive a great deal of profit from this work. Fr. Duenser has built his discourses around the preparation for Mass and around the various petitions in the Mass itself. His lessons are profound and intensely practical. Bruce publishes the book, which runs to 239 pages and sells for $3.50.

The publishing house of Marietti, with headquarters in Turin and Rome, has issued the second edition of the first two volumes of the *Theologia biblica* by Fr. Ceuppens, O.P., Professor of exegesis at the Angelico. The two volumes, *De Deo uno* (307 pp.) and *De sanctissima Trinitate* (299 pp.), are invaluable for students of sacred theology. The author takes the pertinent scriptural texts for each individual thesis within the treatise under consideration and shows the precise meaning which can legitimately be drawn from each one of them. The two volumes recently re-edited contain no teaching as controversial as that which Fr. Ceuppens has included in a later volume of the same series, his *Mariologica biblica.* Each of these volumes is listed as selling for 950 Italian lire, which would amount roughly to about a dollar and a half. The same firm has just published the first volume of what will eventually be a four-volume *Manuale philosophiae* by Giovanni di Napoli. This first volume, written in admirably clear Latin, deals with the general introduction to philosophy, logic, and cosmology. Thomistic in tone, the book is well adapted for the instruction of beginners.

The Newman Press of Westminster, Maryland, has recently reprinted the excellent work of Fr. G. H. Joyce, S.J., *The Catholic Doctrine of Grace.* One of the most useful theological works in our language, Fr. Joyce's book has long been unavailable in bookstores. Fr. Joyce adopted what is obviously the best course for a work of this popular type, and did not introduce anything on the Thomist-Molinist controversy into his book. He centered his attention on the gift of sanctifying grace and upon its conditions, and added valuable chapters on "The Church, The Home of Grace," and on "Grace and Glory." The Newman reprint runs to 267 pages and sells for $2.50.

A very useful collection of short sermons on Our Lady is to be found in *Mary the Blessed the Beloved,* by Fr. Timothy Harris of the Maynooth Missions. The twenty instructions which together fill 119 pages, are adapted for the various Marian feasts of the ecclesiastical year. The book is published by Clonmore and Reynolds, Ltd., of Dublin.

A book which our priests in the parochial ministry will find really invaluable is *The Sacristan's Manual,* by Fr. Denis G. Murphy, a volume which carries an introduction by the Most Reverend Archbishop of Birmingham. Fr. Murphy has set down all the liturgical law pertaining to the function of the sacristans and has, at the same time, included in his book innumerable practical suggestions for the effective ordering of the church building itself. Some of his teachings, as those on the choir dress of various Canons, will satisfy a certain curiosity but will be of no practical importance for priests of the United States. *The Sacristan's Manual* is a book of 156 pages. It costs $2.50. It is published in this country by the Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland.

The same firm has given us the first American edition of *Can Christ Help Me?* by that great veteran of Catholic letters, Fr. Martindale, S.J. Written especially for the benefit of those whom the author describes as "after-Christians," the book sets forth the claims and the credentials of Christ, and gives admirable proof

that Our Lord Himself is available to all who will follow the impulses of His grace. *Can Christ Help Me?* is a book of 205 pages, which sells for $2.25.

One of the best books available in English on the newly defined dogma of Our Lady's Assumption is the work recently translated by John Manning Fraunces, S.J. It is *The Glorious Assumption of the Mother of God,* by the French Jesuit scholar, Joseph Duhr. Published in 1946, the work was never intended to rival such monumental productions as those of Fathers Jugie and Balic. It does, however, focus attention on the patristic background of the theology of the Assumption. More recent studies, particularly those of Dr. Rush of Catholic University, have opened the way for a better appreciation of the function of the apocrypha in the history of this teaching than that contained in Fr. Duhr's work. Nevertheless, this book will be of great service to our priests and people until the appearance of studies based upon the Apostolic Constitution *Munificentissimus Deus.* The publisher, P. J. Kenedy and Sons of New York, and the translator, deserve the thanks of American Catholics for making this study available.

The distinguished French Jesuit Raoul Plus is certainly one of the most competent and one of the most popular spiritual writers of our time. The Newman Press of Westminster, Maryland, has just issued English translations of three of his best known manuals of meditation, *Some Rare Virtues, Facing Life; Meditations for Young Men,* and *Facing Life; Meditations for Young Women.* The first of these books sells for $1.75, and the other two for $1.50. Those well acquainted with spiritual literature appreciate the fact there is none of the near-naturalism and mediocrity which disfigure some recent books of meditation in any of the writings of Fr. Plus.

The current interest in things mystical has made the appearance of the *Selected Writings of St. Teresa of Avila: A Synthesis of Her Writings* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1950), providential in our country. Msgr. William J. Doheny, C.S.C., one of the Justices of the Sacred Roman Rota, has edited this fine work. The first and the last chapters of the book deal directly with the experiences of the great Saint. The remainder of the work treats of those aspects of the spiritual life discussed and explained by St. Teresa in the course of her writings.

Msgr. Doheny reveals his absolute mastery of a very difficult subject. He has made it possible for a person, within the covers of one book, to read in her own words a complete outline of the Saint's own spiritual teachings, so strongly recommended to the faithful by the Church itself. The English text used in this volume is that of E. Allison Peers. Msgr. Doheny's brilliant compilation runs to xxxv + 443 pages. It is priced at five dollars.

The Capuchin Father Heribert Jone has written one of the most popular treatises on moral theology to appear during the twentieth century. Now he has published the first part of a commentary on the Code of Canon Law, which deserves and promises to be tremendously influential in that field. The first volume of the *Commentarium in codicem iuris canonici,* published by Verlag Ferdinand Schoeningh of Paderborn in Germany, is a book of 627 pages. The paper-covered edition sells for 20 German marks, and the cloth-bound copy for 24. This first volume covers the first two books of the Code.

The Rev. Dr. Paul Siwek, S.J., Research Professor at Fordham University, has recently published a devastating evaluation of the phenomena asociated with Konnersreuth. *Une stigmatisée de nos jours: Étude de psychologie religieuse* is published by Lethielleux of Paris. A well-documented volume of 174 pages, Fr. Siwek's work is a forceful warning against a tendency on the part of some Catholics to look upon all the manifestations attributed to Theresa Neumann as factors almost on the level of divine public revelation itself.

The learned author does not pretend to adduce all the arguments opposed to his thesis that all of the extraordinary phenomena in this case can be attributed to purely natural causes. Furthermore, in explicitly repudiating any suggestion of wilful deceit on the part of Theresa and her fellow-villagers, Fr. Siwek seems to run counter to conclusions which he himself manifestly favors. He quotes with evident approval the judgment of "eminent savants" to the effect that, during the period when she was under observation, "Theresa Neumann ate and drank nothing, or only a very small amount. But normally she takes some nourishment and something in the way of drink" (p. 165). The author himself places too much reliance on such phenomena as "telepathy" and "hysteria." Nevertheless, his book will do a great deal of good at a time when altogether too much attention has been paid to these extraordinary "spiritual" manifestations.

The publishing house of Herder in St. Louis has again made available the long out-of-print masterpiece, *The Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ in Meditations* by Maurice Meschler, S.J., translated by Sister Mary Margaret, O.S.B. The two volumes sell for twelve dollars. The work is one of the best meditation manuals available in the English language.

The Bruce Publishing Company of Milwaukee has just published the first English translation of one of the great scientific works on the life of Our Lord. Fr. Ferdinand Prat's *Jesus Christ: His Life, His Teaching, and His Work* has been put into English from the sixteenth edition of the French original by Fr. John J. Heenan of Georgetown University. The two-volume publication sells for twelve dollars.

In many ways Fr. Prat's work is the most completely satisfactory of all the modern treatises on Our Lord's life. The author, who is best known for his *Theology of St. Paul*, spent a great portion of his own life in the Holy Land, and thus his treatment of the subject is enriched by a first-hand knowledge of the geography and the local conditions of the places where Our Lord labored during the course of His years of the hidden life and of the public ministry. Furthermore Fr. Prat had an outstanding grasp of the teachings presented by the great scholastic commentators, and this aspect of his book makes it definitely more useful than other recent writings on the same subject. Altogether, for the priest who desires a standard life of Christ for his own instruction and for the preparation of his own sermons, there is no work quite as good as the treatise by Fr. Prat.

The Indulgence of the Jubilee

If the indulgences were not of the value which the Church preaches, all the preachers of indulgences, beginning from the most authoritative, would be sinning mortally, and this is absurd. We repeat therefore that, given the authority of him who grants the Jubilee and the charity of those who receive it, and piety as the legitimate cause which includes the honor of God and the good of one's neighbor, the value of indulgences is assured. In this there is no abuse of the divine mercy as the Jansenists asserted, neither is there any detraction from justice since, properly speaking, no punishment is cancelled but the sufferings of a just man are attributed to a sinner, to whom the payment of his debt is granted in this manner.

—The late Fr. Mariano Cordovanni, in "The Theology of the Jubilee," printed in *Holy Year MCML: Official Bulletin of Central Committee*, 5 (June, 1950), 29.